

Modern Philology

VOL. VI

January, 1909

No. 3

PIERS PLOWMAN

THE WORK OF ONE OR OF FIVE

I

Next to the *Canterbury Tales*, the poem usually called *Piers Plowman* is the greatest literary work produced by England during the Middle Ages; and it was considered so from the first, these two poems being almost equally popular. Fifty-seven manuscripts have preserved for us Chaucer's tales; forty-five *Piers Plowman*. This latter work is a unique monument, much more singular and apart from anything else than Chaucer's masterpiece. It is more thoroughly English; of foreign influences on it there are but the faintest traces. Allegorical as it is, it gives us an image of English life in the fourteenth century of unsurpassed vividness. If we had only Chaucer we would know much less; Chaucer is at his best when describing individuals; his portraits are priceless. The author of *Piers Plowman* concerns himself especially with classes of men, great political movements, the general aspirations of the people, the improvements necessary in each class for the welfare of the nation. Contemporary events and the lessons to be deducted from them, the hopes, anxieties, problems, and sufferings occupying his compatriots' minds, are never far from his thoughts: plague, storms, French wars, question of labor and wages, bishops becoming royal functionaries, power of the Commons and the king, duties of the nobles, the priests, the workmen. He does not

describe them simply to add picturesque touches, but to express what he feels and show how the nation should be governed and be morally improved. He is not above his time, but of it; he is not a citizen of the world, but a thoroughgoing Englishman and nothing else. Alone in Europe, and, what is more remarkable, alone in his country, he gives us a true impression of the grandeur of the internal reform that had been going on in England during the century: the establishment on a firm basis of that institution, unique then, and destined to be imitated throughout the world, in both hemispheres five hundred years later, the Westminster Parliament. The equivalent of such a line as the following one on the power of king, nobles, and Commons:

Knyghthood hym ladde,
Might of the comunes' made hym to regne,¹

can be found nowhere in the whole range of mediaeval literature; it has but one real equivalent (inaccessible then to the public), the Rolls of Parliament.

No one came in any way near this writer, less than any the great man who, from the window of his chamber in Aldgate tower, cast such a friendly look on the world, such a true citizen of it that, although he had taken part in the French wars, one could, but for the language, read his whole works without guessing on which side he had fought. Himself a member of Parliament, he who described so many men of so many sorts has not left in the whole series of his works a line, a word, allowing his readers to suspect the magnitude of the change England was undergoing; even Froissart gives a better idea of it than he does. His franklin he describes as having been "ful ofte tyme" a "knight of the schire," and instead of something on the part he may have played then, we simply get thereupon the information that

An apas and a gipser al of silk
Heng at his gerdul, whit as morne mylk.

Neither of these two great authors is entirely lacking in the qualities of the other; but reading Chaucer we know better what England looked like, reading *Piers Plowman* we know better what she felt, suffered from, and longed for.

¹ B. Prol. 112.

Deeply concerned with the grave problems confronting his countrymen, the author of *Piers Plowman* seems to have been one of those writers, not a unique case in literature, whose life and book develop together, the one reflecting necessarily the change that years and circumstances may have worked in the other. The life and the book of such men as Montaigne, Rabelais, Tasso, Cervantes, especially the two former, may be quoted as offering parallelisms of the same order.

The *Piers Plowman* visions, made up of a mixture of vague allegories and intensely vivid realities, deal with three principal episodes, the main lines of which the author seems to have had in his mind from the first, the episode of Meed, the episode of Piers Plowman, and the search for Dowel, Dobet, Dobest. Piers Plowman reappears in the last episode; he is the most important and characteristic personage in the work, hence its title. The author, who, like Montaigne for his essays, seems to have been constantly rewriting his poem, gave, as is well known, three principal versions of it, which can be dated from the historical allusions in them: A, 1362-63; B, 1376-77; C, 1398-99.

When a man takes, so to say, for his life's companion and confidant a work of his, adding new parts or new thoughts as years pass on, and as events put their impress on his mind, the way in which these remakings are carried on is ever the same: circumstances command them. The author has before him a copy of his first and shortest text, and he makes here and there, as it occurs to him, an emendation, alters a word or a passage which he thinks he can improve, or which no longer corresponds to his way of thinking; he corrects mistakes and occasionally forgets to correct them, he develops an idea, adds examples and quotations, and sometimes new passages, clashing with others written years before which he forgets to erase, writes a continuation, a new book, a new part. The emendations or additions in the already written text are crammed into the margin or written on slips or fly-leaves. That this practice was in use in the Middle Ages, we might have surmised, as it is difficult to imagine any other; but we know in fact that it was so, as some few samples of manuscripts of this sort have come down to us; manuscripts in which "the author has made

corrections, additions, or suppressions, between the lines, on the margins, and sometimes on separate sheets or fragments of vellum inserted in the quire. It is not always easy to see where those modifications should come in."¹

Great care has been, indeed, ever necessary to prevent mistakes in such cases; they have, in fact, scarcely ever been avoided. Glaring ones remain in works of this sort, of whatever epoch, and which we know to have been revised sometimes by the authors themselves, sometimes by their trustiest friends after their death, and at periods, too, when more attention was paid to correct texts and logical development than in the days of the Plantagenets.

A famous example of this way of rewriting a book is that of Montaigne, whose copy of his own essays, prepared in view of one last edition, is preserved at Bordeaux, the margins covered with scribbled additions,² other additions having certainly been inscribed on slips or fly-leaves (now lost), as they are to be found, not always at their proper place, in the undoubtedly authentic text published soon after Montaigne's death by those devoted friends and admirers of his, Pierre de Brach and Mlle de Gournay.

Superabundant proofs may be given that the author of *Piers Plowman* wrote his revisions in a similar way, handing, however, to less careful people (professional scribes) material requiring more care, with some slips, fly-leaves, afterthoughts, and marginal additions difficult to place at the proper spot. An original with all the leaves, sheets, and slips in good order or comparatively so would yield comparatively good copies; then, by some accident, leaves and slips would get mixed, and scribes would reproduce with perfect composure this jumble of incoherent patches, thus betraying the loose and scrappy state of the text before them, and their own obtuseness.³ Tentative additions, written by the author

¹ Letter from Mr. Léopold Delisle to the author, Chantilly, August 3, 1908. An example of a MS with alterations in the primitive text effected by means of slips of vellum pasted on certain passages, is the MS Royal 14, c, vii, in the British Museum, containing the *Historia Anglorum* of Matthew Paris.

² A facsimile page accompanies P. Bonnefon's contribution to the *Histoire de la littérature française* of P. de Julleville, Vol. III, p. 466.

³ A striking example is that offered by two important MSS of A, one at University College, Oxford, and the Rawlinson Poet. 137, at the Bodleian. Both were copied from the same original which offered a good text, but the leaves or slips wherewith it was made had got disarranged and had been put together in wrong order. Both scribes carefully reproduced

on the margin or on scraps, to be later definitively admitted or not into the text, were inserted haphazard anywhere by some copyists and let alone by others.¹ In his next revision the poet never failed to remove a number of errors left in the previous text, always, however, forgetting a few.

As shown by the condition of MSS, the poet let copyists transcribe his work at various moments, when it was in the making (it was indeed ever in the making), and was in a far from complete and perfect state; sometimes when part or the whole of an episode was lacking, or when it ended with a canto or passus merely sketched and left unfinished.² The scribes who copied the MS Harl. 875 and the Lincoln's Inn MS had apparently before them an original of version A, containing only the first eight passus, that is, the episodes of Meed and Piers. Almost all the other MSS of A have eleven passus and contain the story of Meed, Piers, and the same jumble of incoherent parts. The University College MS "is regular down to passus II, 25, which is immediately followed (on the same page) by passus VII, 71-213, and then returns to I. 132 of passus I, the last four lines of passus I and some twenty lines of passus II occurring twice over. It then goes down to passus VII, 70, when the passage which had already occurred is omitted." In the other MS: "the text is in precisely the same wrong order," says Skeat in the Preface of A, pp. xx and 143* (Early Engl. Text Soc.). Other examples might be quoted. In the MS Cotton, Vespasian B, XVI, in the British Museum, containing a text of C, "written before 1400," and therefore contemporary with the author, passus XVIII was copied from separate sheets or scraps which had also got mixed, so that after XVIII, 186, comes XVIII, 288, "then comes XVIII, 187; then XVIII, 259-287; then XVIII, 188-258, after which comes XVIII, 289, and all the rest of the passus."—Skeat, Preface of C, p. xl.

¹ Of this sort are, to all appearances, the additional lines in the MS Harl. 875 of A, not to be found elsewhere, especially the two passages giving, as in a parenthesis, some supplementary touches, on Fals and on Favel, one of four and the other of three lines (II, 136, 141). In the MS of C, belonging to the Earl of Ilchester, a passage (X, 75-281, Skeat, Preface of C, p. xxxiv) is twice repeated with considerable differences, one of the two versions being, it seems, a first cast of the other. Finding both in the copy before him, the scribe quietly transcribed the two.

Another remarkable example is the one to which Professor Manly drew attention: The four or five lines added at the moment when Piers Plowman is about to make his will, and giving the names of his wife and children (A, VII, 70). They had obviously been written apart on the margin or on a slip, to be inserted later and be duly connected with the bulk of the text. The copyists inserted them as they were, at the place opposite which they found them, and so they form a crude and strange parenthesis. The scribes wrote them, however, precisely as a sort of parenthesis, which was showing more intelligence than in some other cases; the sign indicating a new paragraph usually precedes them; such is the case in the excellent MS Laud 581, fol. 27. The additional MS 35, 287, fol. 296, not only has the same sign, but a blank precedes these lines, so as to show that they are really something apart.

² MS Rawlinson Poet. 38, in the Bodleian, is, as Mr. Skeat has pointed out (preface of B, p. xii, E. E. T. S.), a copy of the B text with some additions and afterthoughts (about one hundred and sixty lines in all), destined to be incorporated later, with a large quantity of others, in the C text. It represents, therefore, one more state in which the work was allowed by the author to be copied. It seems scarcely probable that an independent reviser should have revised so little and allowed the work to be copied after such slight changes.

part of Dowel. Two, however, give us a fragment, and a third, what purports to be the whole of a twelfth passus,¹ a mere sketch anyhow, almost entirely discarded in subsequent revisions. It does not in any case end the story of Dowel; much less does it give what the beginning of the episode had led us to expect concerning Dobet and Dobest. Of these two we were to hear only in the B and C texts, written later, which were also allowed to be copied before they were finished; they were, indeed, never finished at all. Both contain, besides the Meed and the Plowman episodes, seven passus on Dowel, four on Dobet, and only two on Dobest. That the author did not intend to end there is shown, not only because it does not really end (in allegorical matters, it is true, one may end almost anywhere), not only on account of the abnormal brevity of the Dobest part, but also because, in the Bodleian MS Laud 656 of the C text, one of the best and most trustworthy, after the conclusion of the second and last *de facto* passus on Dobest, occur the words: "Explicit passus secundus de dobest et incipit passus tercius." These words do not seem to have been added, as Mr. Skeat suggests, by mistake, but because the copyist read them in his original. That a continuation was really expected is shown by the blank pages left for it: the leaf on which this note appears, as well as the three following ones (somewhat damaged by somebody who wanted bits of vellum and cut off some strips), remain blank in the MS, and these leaves belong, as I have recently verified, to the quire on which the Visions are written, not to the work coming next in the book.

Works of the *Piers Plowman* type are rarely finished. The life of men who take their book for their confidant comes to an end before their book does. The English dreamer no more finished his *Piers Plowman* than Montaigne his *Essays*, or Rabelais his *Gargantua*. But while the author allowed incomplete texts to go about, there is no doubt that each successive episode was in

¹The MS of version A at University College, Oxford, has 18 lines of this twelfth passus; the Ingilby MS has 88 lines and there stops short, the state of the MS showing, according to Skeat (*Parallel Extracts of 46 MSS*; Early Engl. Text Soc., p. 29), that the scribe had no more to copy. The MS Rawlinson Post. 137, at the Bodleian, contains what purports to be the whole passus, but as, in this case also, the original MS did not supply a complete text, a man called John But, of whom more hereafter, took upon himself to add to it a sensational ending of his invention.

his mind when he laid down his pen after having finished the foregoing one, which shows sameness and continuity of purpose. For the two first, Meed and Piers, though more loosely connected than the rest, there can be no doubt, as they were written together in the same mood and style, and made public together; there is no copy where they appear separate. For the last episode, a tripartite one, dealing with Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest, the connection with the previous ones is established by the last part of the last passus (VIII) concerning Piers, where the author represents himself pondering about Dowel and the necessity of securing his help: pardons, Pope's bulls, triennals will be no good, "bote Dowel the helpe;" may we so behave, "er we gon hennes," that we may claim then, "we duden as he (Dowel) us hiȝte."¹ That the Dowel episode would come next, if anything came, is thus made obvious; that it would be a tripartite one is shown from the beginning of this new part: (1) MSS of the A text have there such a heading as, "Incipit hic Dowel, Dobet, et Dobest," making clear what was the ultimate purpose of the author, though as a matter of fact Dowel alone, and only in part, was yet written; (2) The text itself of the first passus concerning Dowel also forecasts the treble account which was to be given only years later, in versions B and C, but was, even so early as 1362, in the author's mind. In the very first passus concerning Dowel (ninth of the whole work) Thought calls the dreamer's attention to those three beings, those three steps toward perfection:

"Dowel," quod he, "and Dobet and Dobest þe þridde
Beoþ þreo faire vertues and beoþ not fer to fynde."²

That these three versions of the *Piers Plowman* poem exist is certain; that they were written by someone cannot be considered a rash surmise. Of that one we know little; but that little is considerably better than nothing; better than in the case of more than one mediaeval work of value, *Morte d'Arthur*, for example, *Gawayne and the Green Knight*, or *Pearl*, in which cases we are reduced to mere suppositions.

For *Piers Plowman*, we have what the manuscripts tell us in their titles, colophons, or marginal notes; what the author tells us

¹ A, VIII, 187.

² A, IX, 69.

himself in his verses; and what tradition has to say, being represented by one man at least whose testimony is of real weight.

Without exception, all those titles, colophons, marginal notes, and testimonies agree in pointing to the succession of visions, forming, at first, 8 or 12, and lastly 23 passus, as being one work, having for its general title *Piers Plowman*, and written by one author. MSS containing the three episodes of Meed, Piers Plowman properly so called, and Dowel, begin thus: "Hic incipit liber qui vocatur pers plowman;"¹ and end thus: "Explicit tractatus de perys plowman."² The continuity of the work is also shown by the numeration of the passus in several MSS; the MS Add. 35,287, for example, of text B, where we are told, at the end of the Piers Plowman episode, that the new passus now beginning is, at the same time, the first of Dowel and the eighth of the total work;³ when we have had not only Dowel, but Dobet and Dobest, occurs then the colophon: "Explicit hic Dialogus petri plowman." The excellent MS Laud 581, also of text B, at the Bodleian, has the same way of counting the passus: "Passus octavus de visione et primus de dowel. . . . Passus xvj^{us}, et primus de dobet."⁴

The manuscripts thus connect together the several parts of the poem, showing that one whole work, under the general title of *Piers Plowman*, is in question. In the same fashion, all the notes found on their leaves, the allusion in the work, and tradition, attribute the poem to one single author.

Some of these notes vary as to the name or the form of the name or surname; not one implies more than one author for the whole. At the end of the Piers Plowman episode properly so called, three MSS have the note: "Explicit visio Willelmi W. de petro Plowman. Et hic incipit visio ejusdem de Dowel."⁵ Three MSS assert therefore, in express fashion, that Dowel and the rest are by the same author. The more probable name and surname

¹ MS Rawlinson Poet. 137, in the Bodleian, a text of A, the only one with John But's addition, dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century.

² MS Harl. 3954, ab. 1420 (Skeat), containing 11 passus, and being a mixture of the A and B versions.

³ Fol. 36. This MS, now in the British Museum, was formerly the MS Ashburnham CXXIX.

⁴ Fol. 33a and 62a; same colophon: "Explicit hic dialogus petri plowman."

⁵ (1) An early MS belonging to the Earl of Ilchester; (2) the MS Douce 104, in the Bodleian Library, dated 1427; (3) the MS Digby 102, same library, middle of fifteenth

for our author are William Langland (or Longlond). The name William occurs in a number of places and cannot be doubted: "Incipit visio Willelmi Explicit visio Willelmi. . . . A lovely lady calde me by name—And seide, 'Wille, slepest thou?'"¹

"What art thou?" quath ich "that my name knowest?"
 "That wost thou, Wille," quath he "and no wight betere."²

The surname Langland (Longlond) is to be found in full in a punning line of the B text, the syllables being arranged in a reversed order:

I have lyved in *londe*, quod I· My name is *longe Wille*.³

If we discarded the punning intention, the line would have little enough meaning: to "live in land" does not convey any very clear idea; so little indeed, that when revising his text for the third time, and choosing not to repeat his confidence, the author not only suppressed the "*longe Wille*," but also the "*lived in londe*," which left alone would have, to be sure, betrayed nothing, but would have been simply meaningless. He wrote:

Ich have lived in London· meny longe ȝeres.⁴

That the line was of interest as giving the author's name was not noticed only by the critics of today; it drew attention from the first. In the margin of the MS Laud 581, opposite the before-

century, all three containing the C text. See Skeat's edition (E. E. T. S.) of C, pp. xxxvii, xlv, xlvii. The word represented by an initial (W.), an abbreviation habitually recalling the place of birth or origin, has been hypothetically, and with no certitude, interpreted as meaning "Wigorniensis" (Skeat) or "of Wychwood" (Pearson).

¹ C, II, 5.

² C, XI, 71.

³ B, XV, 143.

⁴ C, XVII, 286. To give one's name, or someone else's, in a more or less enigmatical fashion was quite customary in Langland's day. Mr. Skeat has been the first to show that when he spoke of the "the wikked Nest" (*Monk's Tale*), Chaucer meant Olivier de Mauné, whose name he simply translated. I have quoted the example of Christine de Pisan in my *Piers Plowman*. Another example is Gower, who wrote:

Primos sume pedes Godefredi desque Johanni,
 Principiumque sui Wallia jungat eis
 Ter caput amittens det cetera membra.

— *Vox Clamantis*, Prol. to Book I.

Langland seems to have considered that some inconvenience might result from his having said so much, and he suppressed in text C, as said above, his veiled confidence.

quoted verse, occur the words in fifteenth-century handwriting: "Nota the name of thauct[our]."¹ The carefully written MS Additional 35,287, which has been revised by a contemporary corrector, supplies very important evidence. The rule followed in it is that Latin words or names of real personages are written in large letters and underlined in red, and the names of imaginary beings are not distinguished in any way from the rest of the text. Thus the names of Meed, Holy Church, Robert the Robber, etc., are written like any other word. But the names of Samson, Samuel, Seneca, Kings Edmund and Edward are underlined in red. The name of "Longe Wille" is underlined in red and written in larger letters than the rest of the line, thus taking rank in those of real and not of imaginary beings.

Various notes and more or less detailed statements inscribed on several MSS are to the same effect. In the MS Ashburnham CXXX appear, inside the cover, in a handwriting of the fifteenth century, the words, "Robert or William Langland made pers ploughman."² In the Dublin MS occurs the well-known statement, also written in the fifteenth century: "Memorandum quod Stacy de Rokayle, pater Willielmi de Langlond . . . qui prædictus Willielmus fecit librum qui vocatur Perys Ploughman." John Bale, later, who took so much trouble, in the course of his "laboryouse journeys," to gather all available information concerning old English writers, inserted in his *Catalogue* a somewhat detailed notice which, if it contains some doubtful assertions (he himself states that several points are indeed doubtful), is certainly the result of personal investigations. He asserts once more that *Piers Plowman* is the work of one poet, called "Langland." Not content with printing his statement in his Latin *Catalogue*, he repeated it, in an abbreviated form, on the cover of one of the MSS he handled, namely the before-quoted Ashburnham MS CXXX of the B text: "Robertus Langlande, natus in comitatu Salopie in villa Mortimeris Clybery in the Clayland and within viij miles of Malvern hills, scripsit piers ploughman."³

¹ Fol. 64a.

² Skeat, B, Preface, p. xxii (E. E. T. S.).

³ Skeat, A, Preface, p. xxxv (E. E. T. S.).

Unity of the work, condition of the MSS, allusions in the text or out of it, marginal notes, tradition concerning both work and author agree well together. From the first, the poem has been held to consist of a succession of visions forming one single poem, as the *Canterbury Tales*, composed of a succession of tales, are only one work; and to have been written by one single author, called William or Robert (in fact certainly William) Langland. An attempt has recently been made to upset all that has been accepted thereon up to now.

II

During the last few years, Professor Manly has devoted his time and thoughts to *Piers Plowman*, not without notable effect. In two essays of great value he has made known the result of his studies and the inferences he thinks he can draw from what he has discovered.

His main and most interesting discovery, one which entitles him to the gratitude of every lover of mediaeval literature, consists in his having pointed out that a passage in the three versions had been misplaced in every MS and consequently in every edition, making complete nonsense where it was, while it would make sense elsewhere. Scribes, correctors, readers, editors, printers, and critics innumerable had seen the passage for five hundred years without noticing anything strange about it. Mr. Manly saw what nobody had seen, and the moment he spoke everybody agreed with him. Even if, in the end, the theories he thereupon put forth are not admitted, his merit will ever be that of the inventor; that of others, at best, the merit of the improver. There are several sorts of discoverers; Professor Manly belongs to the best and rarest, being one of those whose courtesy equals their learning and dialectical cleverness.

The discovery and theories of Professor Manly form the subject of two essays by him, one in *Modern Philology*, January, 1906, called "The Lost Leaf of Piers the Plowman," the other being the chapter on "Piers the Plowman and Its Sequence," in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. II, 1908.

Combining what he had discovered with the impressions derived

from a careful reading of the three texts in succession, he came to the conclusion that *Piers Plowman* "is really the work of five different men," to the critics' imagination being due "the creation of a mythical author of all these poems."¹

It may be, I think, in the interest of all to get rid at once of one of these five, and reduce the number to four. Even so reduced Professor Manly's theory, as will be seen, will prove hard enough to sustain. To admit John But to the honor of being one of the authors of the poem is indeed going too far. At the time when Richard II was "kyng of pis rewme," a copy of version A came to the hands of a silly scribbler who, as he says, "meddled of makyng." Finding the poem unfinished, and unaware of much more having been composed and made public since (for version B, at least, was then in existence), he added a senseless ending of his own, volunteering the information that Death had killed the author, now "closed under clom." He was so good as to give his name, so that we know for sure, on his own testimony, that "Johan But" was a fool.²

This spurious ending, preserved in only one MS and of which no trace is to be found in any of the continuations of the poem, no more entitles John But to the dignity of co-author, than do the lines added by scribes to make known their thirst, and their joy at having finished copying *Piers Plowman*:

Now of pis litel book y have makyd an ende,
Goddis blessing mote he have þat drinke wil me sende.³

Let us therefore speak only of the four remaining authors, not an insignificant number, whose contribution to the total work is thus divided by Mr. Manly: Author I wrote passus I-VIII of A, containing the Meed and Piers Plowman episodes; Author II wrote the fragment on Dowel occurring in various MSS of A; to

¹ *Cambridge History*, II, p. 1.

² The passage on Death having killed the author seems to me, as to Professor Manly, to be the product of But's brain (so to speak). In his Oxford edition Mr. Skeat suppresses as spurious only the twelve last lines, from "And so bad Iohan But," etc., and in his E. E. T. S. edition he leaves a blank between these lines and the rest. As a matter of fact there is no blank in the MS, nor anything to distinguish these lines from what went before.

³ MS Douce 323 (A text).

Author III are due the emendations and additions in text B; to Author IV the emendations and additions in text C.

Before studying the reasons alleged in support of this thesis, it may be observed that, to carry conviction, they must be very strong, not only because, as pointed out above, the spirit pervading *Piers Plowman* is not to be found anywhere else, and if four poets instead of one were imbued with it (the four being besides of great merit), it is singular that they all chose to manifest it by anonymous additions to the work of someone else, the same work in each case; not only because all testimonies and notes in the MSS contradict this theory; not only because, if the shadowy character of one author unseen, unmet by any contemporary, is strange, the same happening for four people concerned with the same problems would be a wonder; but also because to suppose four authors adding new parts to a poem and freely remodeling the old ones, is to suppose also that, as soon as Author I had finished writing, he would have died to leave room for Author II who, in his turn, must have written and died; as must have done Author III to make room for Author IV. If Author I, II, or III had survived, they would have protested against the intrusion; or, at least, one or several among them would have written a continuation of his own (the ever-unfinished poem certainly wanted one), so that if he had been unable to prevent interpolations or spurious continuations, he would have given his actual views. But we have no trace of such a thing. There are many manuscripts; yet they give us only one text for each continuation. This is the more remarkable as, if we admit of Professor Manly's own strictures, the intrusion of each successive author must have been very galling to the previous ones. Mr. Manly brings forth a number of proofs demonstrating, as he considers, that the work was actually spoilt in many places by these subsequent contributors, that Author II tried to imitate the style of Author I but failed; that Author III misunderstood, in a number of passages, the meaning of his fore-runners, making nonsense of them all, and that Author IV did the same with Author III. No explanation is indeed possible, except that each of these authors must have written and breathed his last, with absolute punctuality, as moths lay their eggs, gasp,

and die.¹ A very strange, not to say improbable case. What are the proofs?

They are of three different sorts: (1) The shuffled leaf or misplaced passage; (2) Authors III and IV did not understand what their forerunners meant and must, therefore, be different people; (3) the differences of moods, feelings, ways of speaking, literary merit, meter, and dialect are such between the different parts or successive revisions, as to denote four different authors.

The main effort of Mr. Manly bearing on the demonstration that the author of version B cannot be the same as the author or authors of version A, and this discovery concerning the shifted passage being one of his most striking arguments, we shall consider this question first.

III

Having narrated, in the earliest version of the poem, the story of Meed, a story with no end to it, as is the case with all his stories, the author begins to tell his beads, and this, as a matter of course, he seems to imply, puts him to sleep:

And so I blaberde on my beodes: pat brouhte me a-sleepe.²

He has a new vision, as slightly connected as can be with the foregoing one. Conscience delivers a sermon and Repentance advises sinners to repent. "William" himself repents first, dropping "watur with his eȝen;" then "Pernel proud-herte" does the same. Beginning with Pernel, who represents Pride, we have then a confession of the Seven Deadly Sins, sometimes personified by real beings, sometimes remaining sheer abstractions. Some of the portraits are drawn with admirable care and vividness; others are mere sketches so perfunctory and inadequate as to seem rather memoranda to be developed later and put there simply for the name to appear in the list. "Lechour," for example, whose misdeeds the author at other places, in the same version, is not loath to describe in language no less crude than picturesque, gets

¹ It may also be observed that if it frequently occurs that an author leaves a work of his unfinished, the case is rarer with a continuator; it is usually in view of completing what is unfinished that a continuator sets to work. It took time and space for Jean de Meung to finish the *Roman de la Rose*, but he finished it.

² A, V. 8.

only five lines—a simple memorandum to be improved afterward; as was indeed indispensable, for not only are details lacking, but the few that are given are scarcely appropriate. There is no confession at all; Lechour asks mercy for his “misdeeds,” and promises that, for seven years, on Saturdays, he will have only one meal and will drink only water. If the privation he mentions is the only one he means to inflict on himself, it leaves him a margin for many sins, and especially his favorite one. Others, such as Envy (44 lines), Coveitise (39), and Gloton (76), are as full of life as the best passages in Chaucer himself.

Sloth, who comes last, has 14 lines, nearer the Lechour than the Gloton type; he is sorry for his nondescript “sunnes,” and promises that, for seven years, he will not fail to hear mass and matins on Sundays, and no “ale after mete” will keep him from church in the evening, which, if admissible, is not strikingly fitting. This said, a continuation follows, the inappropriateness of which, after so many centuries, Mr. Manly was the first to point out.

Immediately after Sloth's solemn promise “to pe Rode,” which, in the usual course, should conclude his speech, come twenty-four utterly irrelevant lines: “And ȝit,” Sloth is supposed to continue saying:

And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn' ȝif I so muche have
Al þat I wickkedliche won' sette I wit hade, etc.¹

The passage deals with the moral obligation for robbers and dishonest people to make restitution. A real being—such as others in the course of these confessions, like “Pernel proud-herte,” or Gloton—Robert the Robber, is then introduced, weeping for his sins, wanting to make restitution, and in despair because he has not the wherewithal. These 24 verses are certainly out of place; some mistake of the scribe, to whom was due the original copy which all the others transcribed, must have caused the mischief, for all the MSS of A, without exception, offer this same unacceptable arrangement.

Here comes Mr. Manly's important deduction: this same unacceptable arrangement *was* accepted by the author of version B.

¹ A, V, 236.

He had certainly before him, when he set to work, a copy of A; and while he introduced in it innumerable alterations and additions, he left this passage at the same wrong place. He could never have failed to notice the mistake if he had really been the author of A; as he did not, he was not.

And there is more than that. The very way in which he tried to get out of difficulty shows that he was not the same man. He noticed that there was something unsatisfactory about the passage: what has Sloth to do with restitution? He also noticed the singular fact that, for some unexplained reason, in this confession of the Seven Deadly Sins, only six appear, Wrath being forgotten. What he did, thereupon, betrayed as much as anything else, according to Professor Manly, the dualism of authorship:

The omission of Wrath and the confusion as to Sloth were noticed by B, and he treated them rather ingeniously. He introduced into the earlier part of Sloth's confession a declaration that he had been so slothful as to withhold the wages of his servants and to forget to return things he had borrowed. To supply a confession of Wrath, he himself wrote a *Confessio Irae*, totally different in style from the work of A, and, indeed, more appropriate for Envy than for Wrath, containing as it does no very distinctive traits of Wrath.¹

These assertions, which we shall take up one by one, are supplemented by an explanation of what, in the opinion of Professor Manly, must have taken place. According to him, the author of the first part of A, the best-gifted and cleverest of all, cannot have forgotten Wrath and must have devoted to it a leaf which was accidentally lost; the same author must have put the passage concerning Robert the Robber where it actually stands; but, between the beginning of this passage and the end of Sloth, must have occurred, on a leaf also lost, lines serving as a transition from Sloth to Robert, lines numerous enough "for the development of the confession of Robert . . . and also for the less abrupt ending of the confession of Sloth"²—an ending, it may be said, at once, not more abrupt than that of several of Sloth's fellow-sins. Very ingenious calculations, based on the average size of MSS and the number of lines in them, led Mr. Manly to the conclusion that those

¹ *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 365.

² *Ibid.*, p. 362.

two passages would correspond, and that the disappearance of one sheet in a quire of the original MS, that is, of the two half-sheets on which the two passages must have been written, is the proper explanation for the two gaps said to exist in the text.

This explanation seems to me absolutely untenable, and I entirely agree with Mr. Bradley who has pointed out¹ that no conceivable lost passage with lines making a transition from Sloth to Robert the Robber could be at all satisfactory. Those two people cannot possibly be grouped together; the category to which Robert belongs is, without possible doubt, Coveitise, who like him is bound to make restitution, and the proper place for the misplaced 24 lines is after Coveitise: A, V, 145. Mr. Bradley adds that such a statement rather confirms than weakens Mr. Manly's theory as to the difference of authors; not only B did not notice that the 24 lines were at the wrong place, but he had not the slightest idea what the right one was.

All these observations can easily be answered.

The author of B, the same I think as the author of A, issued, after a dozen years or more, a new text of his poem, a text which he had had more or less constantly beside him, making changes, corrections, and additions as it occurred to him, the usual way with authors of works of this sort, capable of extension. The copy he used was naturally a copy of A as there was no other text then in existence, with the 24 lines certainly at the wrong place, since he left them there. His changes, which transformed a poem of 2,579 lines into one of 7,241, were very numerous; sometimes slight ones were made, sometimes new quotations were added, sometimes new matter was introduced on a considerable scale: the very way another writer, Montaigne, also absorbed in his thoughts, actually worked. Preceded by some lines on the necessity of giving back ill-gotten goods ("And zit I-chulle zelden azeyn," etc.), the passage on Robert the Robber, a logical sequence to Coveitise, forms a separate incident, not at all necessary to make the confession of the Deadly Sins complete; it has all the appearances of an afterthought; such afterthoughts as the author, or anyone in his place, would write on separate slips left loose or which might get

¹ *Athenaeum*, April 21, 1906.

loose, and which Adam Scrivener of sleepy pen would copy anywhere. And as Scrivener, in the present case, did not know what to do, he put the stray lines at the end of the passus when the rest of the confessions were finished, so Robert would come just before the "pousent of men" who mourned for their sins, "weopyng and weylyng."

For what concerns the author himself, maybe, while making so many changes in so many places, he never paid any attention to this passage (in which, as a matter of fact, he introduced no change at all¹); maybe also he thought of transferring it to its proper place and neglected to mark it accordingly or to see that the removal was made. The fact that the confession of Coveitise, as remodeled in version B, contains a passage, not in A, where restitution is insisted upon, at great length, in most pressing language, lends probability to this latter hypothesis. In version A the sins of this personage were told with some detail, but nothing except the vaguest allusion was made to necessary amends. In B, on the contrary, restitution is one of the points about which we hear most, the added passage being highly picturesque and in the author's best vein. Did you never make restitution? says Repentance—

"ȝus, ones I was herberwed," quod he, "with an hep of chapmen,
I roos whan thei were arest' and yrifled here males."

"That was no restitucioun," quod Repentance' "but a robberes
theftē"

"I wende ryflynge were restitucioun," quod he' "for I lerned nevere
rede on boke,
And can no Frenche in feith' but of the ferthest ende of Norfolke."²

The restitution here alluded to is precisely that which a penitent thief should make, the question being of stolen goods. Much more clearly than the lines added in Sloth (the bearing of which

¹ Two lines, 248, 249, of A are omitted in B, a mere scribe's oversight and one, as Skeat has noticed (not at all in view of the present discussion), particularly difficult to avoid in copying alliterative verses. (Preface of A, 1867, p. xvi.)

² B, V, 232; and further on, Repentance reverts to the same subject:

"Thow art an unkynde creature' I can the nouȝte assoille,
Til thow make restitucioun' and rekne with hem alle,
And sithen that resoun rolle it' in the registryre of hevене,
That thow hast made uehe man good' I may the nouȝte assoille;
Non dimittitur peccatum, donec restituitur abiatum." —B, V, 276.

will presently be examined), this addition looks like a preparation for the appearance, shortly after, of Robert the Robber, who, too, should make restitution, but has "nouȝte wher-of."

That nevertheless, owing to the author's omission or the scrivener's "negligence and rape," as Chaucer would say, the Robert and Restitution passage was left, as before, at the wrong place, has nothing very prodigious or extraordinary. There is not even any need to suggest (though it may have been the case) that the poet happened to be of a conspicuously careless nature. The most careful people may be at times absent-minded. As I was talking recently about the *Piers Plowman* problem with a writer, who feels greatly interested in it (as well as in a few other questions), whose works have had a wide circulation and have been scrutinized by critics, not all of them over-friendly, he mentioned that something of the sort had happened to himself. Opening, thereupon, at p. 13, the *Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter*, a work made up of several essays, written at different moments, with additions and afterthoughts noted on slips, he pointed out that two slips with the same statement had not only been allowed in by him, but the contents of the two were repeated in the same page, giving to the whole a, to say the least, somewhat ludicrous appearance:

The bobcats are very fond of prairie dogs, and haunt the dog towns as soon as spring comes and the inhabitants emerge from their hibernation. . . .

Bobcats are very fond of lurking round prairie-dog towns as soon as the prairie dogs come out in spring. . . .

Not only critics, friendly or otherwise, never noticed this strange occurrence, but the author himself read three proofs of the work, gave several editions of it, and has only just now had the mistake removed.

Stray sheets with corrections and afterthoughts on them are certainly difficult to handle and require a perseverance in attention which, without speaking of scribes, famous authors sometimes lack. To give only one more example, I may quote that of Cervantes who, as everyone knows, represents Sancho Panza quietly mounting his ass just after Gines de Passamonte had stolen it from him. The theft was an afterthought that Cervantes

forgot to make fit properly with the rest of his work. Having become aware of the mistake, he revised his text, but insufficiently, and left one or two passages in which Sancho is shown still riding the stolen animal. He made fun of it all later, in chaps. iii and iv of the second part of his immortal book; being no less merry about his mishap than the President of the United States about his own.

The same happened to Langland who, even supposing him to exhibit no conspicuous carelessness, was certainly not endowed with a strictly geometrical mind, and who, judging from results, continued to the last using slips, and loose sheets that were apt to go astray. Another proof, unnoticed till now, may be given from the C version. In this text the author has added, among other passages, some ten lines in the speech delivered by Piers Plowman before he makes his will:

Consaile nat the comune the Kyng to displease;¹

and do not, "my dere sone," hamper parliamentary, judicial, or municipal authorities in the fulfilling of their duties. These lines occur in C, after the text of parenthesis giving us the name of Piers's wife and children; they make no proper continuation, neither to this nor to what Piers was saying before, for he was saying that he would help all, except "Jack pe Jogelour" and "folke of that ordre." What "dere sone" is he now addressing? The passage thus inserted is so unsatisfactory that Mr. Skeat's marginal analysis ceases there,² as it is difficult indeed to make anything of it.

But the whole can easily be set right. In an earlier part of his same speech, Piers had been addressing especially the Knight, a good knight, full of the best will; he had recommended him to behave well, and to avoid dissolute people. To this advice in A and B, he added in C one line, as a link for his afterthought, viz., the line reading:

Contreplede nat conscience ne holy kirke ryghtes.³

Owing to a slip going wrong or to some such mishap, the ten lines

¹ C, IX, 35.

² C text (E. E. T. S.), p. 143.

³ C, IX, 53.

were not inserted here but elsewhere, making there perfect nonsense. Removed here, they fit in perfectly. Piers, continuing to address his "dere sone," says:

Consaile nat the comune the Kyng to displese,
Ne hem that han lawes to loke. . . .

Place these ten lines after the above, and all comes right: "Con-treplede nat conscience . . . consaile nat the comune," etc. When Piers has finished this review of a knight's duties (quite incomplete in the earlier versions), the old text is resumed and fits also perfectly, the Knight saying as before: "Ich assente by Seynt Gyle." Then comes also very appropriately Piers's declaration as to the disposition he has to make before his journey, and, as a last preparation, the drawing-up of his testament.

There can be no doubt that this arrangement is the right one and was intended by the author; no doubt either that this is one more case of an afterthought which the original copyist inserted at the wrong place, the author taking no notice; and as there was no further revision the mistake was never corrected.

With version B and the misplaced Robert and Restitution passage, the case was different; if Langland failed then to have the error corrected it was not so when, for the last time, he revised his whole work. To all appearances the revision was carried on in the same way as before, with a B text before him, erasures, corrections, and additions being made in the text, on the margins, or on slips. One of the author's most important corrections is (and this had been noticed before by critics) the new place in the text allotted by him to this same Robert and Restitution incident. That place is certainly the right one, the one Mr. Bradley suggests, and which the whole bearing of the passus imperiously commands. It comes after the confession and repentance of Coveitise.

One particular which has not been noticed deserves, however, special attention. The twenty-four lines consist, as we know, of six verses on the necessity of making restitution, followed by what concerns Robert the Robber; the six lines cannot be properly attached, such as they are, to any part of the poem, neither where they stand in A and B, nor where the confession of Coveitise

ends, which is their real place. Professor Manly supposes, as we have seen, a big gap supplying room enough for a transition from Sloth to Robert and Restitution. C, who being, as I think, the author, knew better, not only transferred the passage to the end of the confession of Coveitise, but supplied what was lacking to make it fit. What was lacking was not eighty lines as Mr. Manly would have us believe, but *one*.

Now, let anybody who has not the poem at his finger's ends try to imagine what single verse can make sense of that nonsense: we have our twenty-four lines, beginning, in the two texts where they are misplaced, with:

And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn' ȝif I so muche have,¹

and continuing with the passage telling us of Robert who "on *Reddite* he looked," and unable to repay, wept full sore. What is that *Reddite* he looked upon, and how can the passage be made to form a complete and satisfactory whole? No such personage as *Reddite* has been mentioned. There is not even any mention of some scroll with that word on it. I submit that only the author who knew from the first what he meant, could supply the single necessary verse. Let anyone who thinks he has a chance, try his skill.

Here is, in the meantime, what Langland did. The single line he added makes it clear that his intention had been, not to introduce one real man (Robert), but two real men; the restored passage reads:

Then was ther a Walishman' was wonderliche sory,
He highte ȝyvan ȝeld aȝeyn'² ȝf ich so moche have,
Al that ich wickedelich wan' sytthen ich wit hadde,
And pauh my lifode lacke' leten ich nelle,
Dat ech man shal have hus' er ich hennes wende³
Roberd þe ryfeler' on *reddite* lokede
And for þer was nat wher-with' he wepte ful sore.

—C, VII, 309.

¹ A, V, 236; B, V, 463.

² The scribe who first placed this same passage—minus the torn-off or somehow left-off first line—at the end of the passus in A, considered that he supplied a sufficient connection by simply changing, "He highte ȝyvan ȝeld aȝeyn," which, taken apart, made such nonsense as to strike even a scribe, into, "And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn."

³ Mr. Skeat considers these and the following lines, six in all, as forming the name of the Welshman, a suggestion he offers somewhat dubiously, as he abstained in both his

Now we know, and it is not the least significant result of the introduction of this one line previously dropped by a careless copyist, now we know what was meant by Robert the Robber "on *Reddite* he looked;" he has at present someone to look upon, namely his fellow-thief turned penitent: Evan Yield-Again, otherwise Evan *Reddite*, both words being a translation one of the other. Mind, writes Dr. Furnivall, to whom I had submitted this argument, that Yield-Again is a man and *Reddite* a mere word. I mind very well, and draw from it one more argument that we have to do with a single author. For this is not an isolated case of a Latin word being transformed by Langland into a personage having its own part to play, and bearing an English name which is a mere translation of the Latin word. In passus VIII of A (B, VII, 110), at one of the most solemn moments in the whole poem, Piers unfolds his bull in which is written: "*Qui bona egerunt ibunt ad vitam æternam.*" *Qui Bona egerunt* becomes at once Dowel, a separate personage who may help men or not, according to their merits, and the search for whom becomes the subject of the following passus. In the same connection may be quoted another example from a previous passus. In A, II, we hear that "Favel with feir speche" has brought together Fals and Meed. Some lines further on, "Feir speche" has become a steed which Favel rides to go to Westminster, and which is "ful feyntly a-tyred."¹

But why, one may say, select, of all people, poor Evan as a typical thief, willing, it is true, to make restitution, but a thief none the less, and why produce him as a parallel to "Robert the

editions from hyphenating, as he does usually in such cases, the whole succession of words said to compose the colossal name. The hypothesis is not an impossible one as Welsh people were famous for the length of their names and Langland was fond of inventing such appellations. It seems more probable, however—MSS giving of course no indication—that the name is simply Evan Yield-Again, and that the rest is the speech by which he, quite appropriately, shows that he is really "wonderliche sory." It frequently occurs with our poet that the transition from the indirect to the direct speech is very abrupt, and it is not always easy to be quite sure where the talking begins. See, for example, the passage B, II, 146, where the author tells us of Favel distributing money to secure false-witnesses; it ends by a line which we must suppose to be pronounced by Favel himself. The money is given, we are told, to secure the good will of notaries,

And feffe False-witnes' with foreines ynowe;
"For he may Mede amaistrye" and maken at my wille."

Cf. C, III, 158, where Skeat hypothetically attributes a longer speech to Favel.

¹ A, II, 23, 140.

Robber," also a penitent thief, but a thief? With Robert the case is clear; the association of the two words, as Mr. Skeat, in his invaluable treasure of *Notes*, has well shown, was traced: "Per Robert, robber designatur."¹ But what of Evan, the Welshman?"

The name and the man fit the passage one as well as the other. Welshmen were proverbially taunted by their English neighbors with an inclination to thievery (and they, in true neighborly fashion, reciprocated the compliment). Their own compatriot, Giraldus Cambrensis, praises, in his *Description of Wales*, their quick intelligence, sobriety, hospitality, love of their country, but he has a chapter "Quod rapto vivunt," in the first phrase of which he explains that it is not for them a mere question of plundering their neighbors, but that they act likewise "among themselves."² The Parliamentary petitions show, on the other hand, that the complaints were ceaseless against Welshmen for their plunder and robberies; they "robbent et raunsenont et preignent bestes, biens et chateux;" the bordering shires are all spoilt and ruined ("degastez et destruz") owing to their misdeeds,³ and, what is well worthy of remark, those shires whose names and complaints constantly recur in the series of petitions are, to take an example of the year 1376, the year of text B, "Wyrcestre, Salop, Stafford, Hereford, Bristut et Glouc'."⁴ The first-named of these shires which want Welsh thieves to be punished and obliged to make restitution—for this too is mentioned in the petitions⁵—is Worcester, the very region where, on "Malverne hilles," it befell Langland "for to slepe for weyrynesse of wandryng." No wonder that the misdeeds of Evan the Welshman, and Robert

¹ Wright's *Political Songs*, p. 49, mentioned in Skeat's *Notes*, p. 125.

² "Ad hoc etiam rapinis insistere, raptore vivere, furto et latrocinio, non solum ad externos et hostiles populos, verum etiam inter se proprium habent."—*Descriptio Cambriae* . . . Opera, Brewer, Vol. VI, p. 207.

³ Ric. II, 1379-80, *Rolls of Parliament*. Such complaints are particularly numerous during the reign of Richard II.

⁴ 50 Ed. III, *Rolls*, Vol. II, 352.

⁵ In a petition of 2 H. IV, 1400-1, embodying wishes which certainly did not originate then, we find that, to the great detriment of the "countez ajoignantz à les marches de Galys," Welshmen—"les gentz du Galys"—continued to steal "chivalx, juments, boeufs, vaches, berbitz, porks, et altres lour biens." The interested parties ask that these "meffesours" be ordered to make restitution, "lour facent deliverer lour distresses biens et chateux issint prizez et arrestez, saunz ascun dilaye."—*Rolls*, Vol. III, p. 474.

the Robber were linked together in his mind, and that he never had a good word for Welshmen.¹ Even this detail deserves to be noted, that in showing his two penitent thieves, the common robber who is willing to make restitution, but has not withal, and the other who is willing and able to a certain extent, the poet strictly adhered to realities. The Evanses of the border usually carried away sheep and cattle which they might have bodily restored in most cases if they had been truly "sory" for their misdeeds.

It will be admitted, I hope, that once more poem and real facts turn out to fit together quite well, and tally better with my plea than with Professor Manly's. Far from showing a diversity of authors, the study of the question of the shifted passage strongly confirms what other indications led us to believe, namely that the poet who wrote C must have written A also. Both, and consequently B, must be, so far as shown by the facts under consideration, the work of one and the same Langland.

IV

But with reference to the shifted passage, other points have been mentioned by Professor Manly, it will be remembered, as denoting a plurality of authorship. According to him the author of B, not knowing what he was about, tried, "rather ingeniously," to justify the presence of the Robert and Restitution passage after the confession of Sloth, and, in view of this, he introduced in the latter's speech a declaration that "he had been so slothful as to withhold the wages of his servants and to forget to return things he had borrowed."

The author of B, on the contrary, never dreamt, as I take it, of making any such attempt, and if he took any notice at all of the passage, it was to prepare its being removed to where it should appear, though he neglected to see that the change was effected. His additions in the confession of Sloth show, in any case, no intention to lead to the subject of Robert the Robber and of restitution.

¹ "Griffln the Walsche," in the three texts of the same passus where Yield-Again appears, is mentioned as one of the roisterous friends of Gloton (A, V, 167).

As Langland was, at various periods, revising his text, he now and then filled gaps, replaced perfunctory sketches by more finished portraits, and added, as in the case of Coveitise for example, some excellent details to pictures already very good. He did so as it occurred to him, without showing that thoroughness and regularity of design that would have been a matter of course with an independent reviser and continuator, and the *raison d'être* of his work. Anyone, I consider, assigning to himself the task of revising such a poem as the first version of *Piers Plowman*, would not have left Lechour with his five insignificant, not to say irrelevant, lines, which are even reduced to four in B. But an author caring so little for geometrical regularity as Langland did, could very well leave Lechour alone for the present, to remodel his portrait later, or not, as suited his fancy. So it is that only in C do we find a real confession of this sin, in twenty-six lines.

A striking proof of this ungeometrical disposition of mind in our author is supplied by the very question of the Deadly Sins, a disposition, not to say an infirmity, so peculiar as practically to corroborate our belief in the unity of authorship. Every critic has noticed that, in the series of sins depicted in A, passus V, Wrath is lacking. It has never been observed that in this vast poem dealing with the reformation of mankind, in which the Deadly Sins constantly recur to the author's mind, being specifically dealt with four times, out of those four lists only one is complete, as first given in any of the three versions. The order is never the same, which makes it easier for the writer to forget one or the other of the sins; on second thoughts he sometimes corrects his list, sometimes not. An independent reviser would scarcely have acted so.

In the "feffement" of Meed (A, II, 63), the Deadly Sins figure as Pride, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Lechery, Sloth—Wrath is lacking. In the corresponding passage of B and C the order is, as usual, modified: Lechery comes before Gluttony, but the absence of Wrath has been noticed, and we find now mentioned: "the erldome of envye and wratthe togideres."¹

¹ B, II, 83; C, III, 88.

Wrath was certainly absent from Langland's mind when he wrote this version A, as in his next enumeration there of the Sins, that is, in passus V, when they all confess and repent, Wrath is again forgotten. The order is not the same as before, being as follows: Pride, Lechery, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth.¹ Having noticed the lack of Wrath in the previous passage, Langland, when he revised his text, added him here too, in B. This addition is naturally preserved in the C revision, but the order of the series is once more modified. In B the order was Pride, Lechery, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth; in C we have Pride, Envy, Wrath, Lechery, Avarice, Gluttony, Sloth.

Farther on, in the B text, the Seven Deadly Sins appear again as forming spots on the coat of "Haukyn the Actyf man." This is the only complete list, and is as follows: Pride, Wrath, Envy, Lechery, Avarice (alias Coveitise), Gluttony, Sloth.²

Farther on again, the sins are enumerated as constituting the main dangers threatening the wealthy, and the list is: Pride, Wrath, Gluttony, Sloth, Avarice, Lechery, Sloth again, total seven; but Sloth is named twice and Envy is lacking.³

In C, the Haukyn passage is fused with the confessions; but the list of the dangers is preserved. It is not left just as it was, for C notices that, in B, Sloth was named twice; he suppresses the word, therefore, on the least important of the two occasions, and so we have: "hus glotonye and grete synne" (C, XVII, 77), instead of: "his glotonie and his grete sleuthe" (B, XIV, 234). But, in spite of his desire, thus made evident, to revise and improve, the author of C, afflicted with the same infirmity of mind as the author of A and B, does not observe that Envy is lacking; he none the less gravely repeats twice that he is dealing with the "sevene synnes pat per ben" (XVII, 44), that he speaks "of the sevene synnes" (XVII, 61). As there was no further revision, this list remained definitively incomplete. Such peculiarities are indeed so peculiar as to be, in a way, the author's mark—his seal

¹ A, V, 45.

² B, XIII, 276.

³ B, XIV, 215.

and signature.¹ It is most unlikely that any reviser would have failed to "find the concord of this discord."

Concerning the additions to Sloth, in version B, it is easy to show that, like those introduced, at the same time, by the author in the confession of several other sins, they have no object but to bring his description nearer to the generally accepted type. For what regards Sloth, commonly held to be the source and cause of so many other faults, the poet examines the whole life of the slothful man, mainly, in his eyes, the man who *neglects* his duties. This was not at all a strange or original notion, but a commonplace one in those days. The pleasure such a man takes in finding "an hare in a felde" does not, to be sure, correspond exactly to our idea of slothfulness, but it corresponds to Langland's, who shows his sinner neglecting, meanwhile, to make himself proficient in church Latin. Sloth also neglects to come to mass in time, to fulfil his vows, to perform his penances, to keep his own house well, to pay his servants, workmen, and creditors their due, to thank those who have been kind to him. He wastes quantities of "flesche and fische," cheese, ale, etc. His life has ever been one of neglect:

I ran aboute in zouthen and zaf me nouzte to lerne.

There is no intimation that any of his misdeeds was committed with the intention of *winning* money; it was with him mere negligence; if the author of B had really introduced any of these additions in order to make the confession fit with the restitution passage, he would have expressed himself otherwise, or would have chosen another alliterating letter and another word than *wan* in the line:

¹ The following table shows the number and order of the Sins as given in the earliest version where they appear.

A, II	A, V	B, XIII	B, XIV	C, XVII
Pride Envy Avarice Gluttony Lechery Sloth	Pride Lechery Envy Avarice Gluttony Sloth	Pride Wrath Envy Lechery Avarice Gluttony Sloth	Pride Wrath Gluttony Sloth Avarice Lechery Sloth again	Pride Wrath Gluttony Avarice Lechery Sloth
Wrath is lacking	Wrath is lacking		Envy is lacking	Envy is lacking

And ȝete wil I ȝelde aȝein if I so moche have,
Al þat I wikkedly wan.¹

In truth, as I said, Langland had no other intent, in remodeling this passage, than to bring his picture near to the accepted type, and so he did. We may see in Chaucer what was the importance of that sin so summarily dispatched, at first, in the Visions, and how it led people to the *neglect* of all their duties, the temporal ones as well as the spiritual:

Necligence is the norice [of all harme] . . . This foule sinne Accidie is eek ful greet enemy to the lyfode of the body; for it ne hath no purveaunce agayn temporel necessitee; for it forsluweth and forsluggeth, and destroyeth alle goodes temporeles by reccheleesnesse . . . Of [lachesse] comth poverte and destruccioun, bothe of spirituel and temporel thinges.²

In similar fashion the confession of Sloth, as it reads in text B of *Piers Plowman*, ends by an allusion to the state of beggary to which he has been reduced by his "foule sleuthe." Not a word in these additions implies that the author really considered that the Robert and Restitution passage should come next and that he ought to insert details leading up to it.

Dwelling on Wrath, forgotten in version A, and added in version B, Professor Manly thinks he detects a proof of a difference of authorship in the differences of merit and of style. The Wrath confession in B is, according to him, "totally different in style from the work of A, and indeed more appropriate for Envy than for Wrath, containing as it does no very distinctive traits of Wrath. The additions . . . are confused, vague, and entirely lacking in the finer qualities of imagination, organization, and diction shown in all A's work. In A, each confession is sketched with inimitable vividness and brevity."³

The answer is: (1) An author is not bound, under pain of being cleft in twain, always to show the same merits, in every respect, on every occasion, at all times; (2) the confessions in A are not so good, and the additions in B are not so bad as Professor Manly makes them out. As a matter of fact, some of these additions are

¹ B, V, 463.

² *Parson's Tale—De Accidia*, §§ 53 ff.

³ *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 365; *Cambridge History*, II, p. 15.

excellent, and more than one of the cleverest and most humorous touches in the whole poem are to be found in them;¹ others are not so happy. The same may be said of the confessions as first drafted in A, some of which are excellent, and others far from good.

Thus it is that, in version A, supposed to be so perfect, Pride, represented by Pernel Proud-herte, concludes her speech by a promise to

merci be-seche
Of al that ichave i-had' envye in myn herte.²

As Mr. Manly said of the Wrath portrait in B, this is "indeed more appropriate for Envy" than for Pride, and this similarity in aptitude for confusion, if it has any bearing at all on the problem, can but confirm our belief in a unity of authorship. The same repenting Pernel undertakes, in version A, to reform: she will wear a hair smock,

Forte fayten hire flesch' that frele was to synne.

This kind of penance and this allusion to flesh "frail to sin" would certainly fit another Sin better than Pride, as shown by the author of A himself who, in passus III, had had the words "heo is frele of hire flesch" applied to Meed in the same speech where she is described as being "as comuyn as pe cart-wei."³ In this same A text, described as so far above the additions in B, repenting Lechour declares that his penance will consist in eating and drinking less than before on Saturdays; which is, if one may be permitted to say so, to "take it easy." While Professor Manly alleges that the attributes of Wrath in text B would better suit Envy, it turns out that in A, inversely, one of the classical

¹Important additions were introduced in the confession of Coveitise. Repentance obliges the sinner to examine his conscience (a passage has been quoted above, p. 18), and tell of his various misdeeds among chapmen, lords, Lombards, etc. Repentance goes on saying:

"Hastow pite on pore men' bat mote nedes borwe?"
"I have as moche pite of pore men' as pedlere hath of cattes,
Bat wolde kille hem, yf he cacche hem myte' for coveitise of here skynnes."
—B, V, 257.

All the passage is as vivid, sharp, and pregnant as any anywhere in version A.

²A, V, 52.

³A, III, 117, 127.

attributes of Wrath, the sowing of feuds and quarrels, is bestowed on Envy, who says of his neighbor:

Bitwene him and his meyne ichave i-mad wratthe,
Bothe his lyf and his leome was lost thorw my tonge.¹

If this sort of confusion between Wrath and Envy proved anything, it would again prove unity of authorship, as we find it in both A and B. It proves nothing in reality, except that Langland was of his time, and that he was of it as well when he wrote B as when he wrote A. In all mediaeval accounts of the Deadly Sins, the descriptions constantly overlap each other, one of the most remarkable cases being precisely that of Wrath and Envy; the one was held to be the source of the other: "Envye," says Wyclif, "is modir of ire."² "After Envye," says Chaucer's Parson, "wol I descryven the sinne of Ire. For soothly, who-so hath envye upon his neighebor, anon he wole comunly finde him a matere of wratthe, in worde or in dede, agayns him to whom he hath envye." So begins Chaucer's chapter on Wrath in the *Parson's Tale*. Well might Langland include Wrath and Envy in a single "erledome," when revising his first text.

In that description of Wrath so unsatisfactory to Professor Manly, and added to text B, this sin is shown "with two whyte eyen, and nyvelyng (sniveling) with the nose." He goes about sowing discord, making friars and members of the secular clergy hate each other, scattering scandal and jangles in convents (not an insignificant sin this one, according to our author, who had said before, in version A, "Japers and jangelers, Judas children"), behaving so that people meant to live in peace,

Hadde rei had knyves, bi Cryst her eyther had killed other.³

All this is considered by Professor Manly so preposterous that the author of A could never have written anything like it; if the author of B did, he must have been a different man. But, as we have just seen, the author of A was not at all incapable of admit-

¹ A, V, 80. Cf. Chaucer, who, however, is careful to place his statement under *Ire*: "For soothly, almost al the harm that any man dooth to his neighebores comth of wratthe." — *Parson's Tale*, § 34.

² *On the Seven Deadly Sins*, chap. xii.

³ B, V, 165.

ting irrelevant matter into his text, and on the other hand, there was nothing preposterous in these additions; they were, on the contrary, commonplace; such characteristics are paid full attention to by Chaucer's Parson: "Now comth the sinne of hem that sowen or maken discord amonges folk, which is a sinne that Crist hateth outrely." Jangling is another characteristic of Wrath: "Now comth Jangling . . . [and] comth the sinne of Japeres . . . The vileyns wordes and knakkes of Japeris [conforten] hem that travailen in the service of the devel."¹

This same chapter on Ire well shows how vague were the limits assigned then to each sin. Following accepted manuals, and not considering there was any reason for him to make changes, Chaucer speaks, as coming under the scope of Ire, of those who "treten unreverently the sacrament of the auter," of swearing, of the various sinful ways of bringing about miscarriages, of "adjuracioun, conjuracion," charms and the like, of "Flateringe" unexpectedly associated with Wrath: "I rekene flaterye in the vyces of Ire, for ofte tyme, if o man be wrooth with another, thanne wol he flatere som wight to sustene him in his querele." Here is a good occasion for anyone who remembers in what style the rest of the *Canterbury Tales* were written to show that England rejoiced not only in several Langlands but in a large number of Chaucers.

V

Other arguments yet have been put forth in order to show that the author of version B could not have been the author of version A; very telling ones if they held good. Remodeling version A, the author of B is said to have misunderstood or spoilt several passages in it, and he cannot therefore have originally composed that version. The following examples are given, being doubtless the best available ones.²

—"In II, 21 ff. Lewte is introduced as the leman of lady Holy Church and spoken of as feminine." Allusion is here made by

¹ *Sequitur de Ira*, §§ 45, 47.

² *Cambridge History*, II, p. 32.

Professor Manly to the lines in B where the handsome lady "purfiled with pelure" tells the dreamer that Meed has

. . . . ylakked my lemman' pat lewte is hoten
And bilowen hire to lordes' pat lawes han to kepe.

The answer is: (1) There cannot be any question here of B having misunderstood A, as the passage is quite different in both texts, and there is no mention at all of Lewte in A. (2) "Lemman" does not necessarily mean a man and a paramour; to use it otherwise is not to commit any error; a leman is a tenderly loved being of any sex: Spenser's Proteus asks Florimel "to be his leman and his ladie trew." If Florimel could play the part of a leman, why not Lewte? And, as the pelure purfiled lady in the Visions was Holy Church, we may take it for granted that a difference of sex had little to do in her choice of a "lemman." (3) Very possibly there may be nothing more in the passage than a scribe's error, "hire" being put in instead of "hym;" the more probable as the correction is made in C:

And lackyd hym to lordes' that lawes han to kepe.¹

Of B having failed to understand or of having committed any error, there is no trace.

—"In II, 25, False instead of Wrong is father of Meed, but is made to marry her later." It is a fact that we have in A, "Wrong was hir syre," and in B, "Fals was hire fader," also that in B, as in all the other versions, Meed none the less marries Fals.

Without any doubt, when writing B, the author decided to modify entirely the family connections of Meed, and not without good cause. In the first version, so highly praised, the incoherency was such as to make a change indispensable. Wrong was very badly chosen as a father for Meed, and was given, besides, nothing to do. The marriage was not arranged by him; the marriage portion was not supplied by him; in the journey to Westminster he was forgotten; his part was limited to signing first among many others, the "feffment" charter supplied by other people. And while he did nothing in this important occurrence when, as

¹ C, III, 21.

a father, he should have been most busy, he suddenly reappeared in the next passus (as a murderer and a thief); he was then full of activity. Together with Peace, Wit, Wisdom, etc., Meed took part in the scene, but her blood-relationship with Wrong had been entirely forgotten and not a word was said implying any connection between the two: incoherency was there absolute. Wrong, moreover, was too thoroughly an objectionable father for Meed. From Wrong nothing but wrong can come; and yet, in this same text A, no less a personage than Theology assures us that Meed is not so bad after all. She is of gentle blood, "a mayden ful gent; heo mihte cusse þe Kyng for cosyn . . ." How so, if the daughter of Wrong? In the same version, on the other hand, Favel does everything, and acts as the real father; it is he who assumes the responsibility and the charges of the marriage; he who supplies money to secure false witnesses at Westminster, who rejoices with Fals at the prospective success of the lawsuit. It is between him and Fals—Wrong being forgotten—that Meed rides to London.

The obvious thing to do in case of a revision was to suppress Wrong in the marriage preliminaries, and give Meed a less opprobrious parentage. Favel, not so repulsive as Wrong, was a ready-found father, the part of whom he had in fact already been playing. Such are precisely the changes adopted by Langland when re-writing his poem. That Fals instead of Favel appears in the half-line quoted above, owing to an obvious mistake as Meed marries Fals immediately after, is of no importance. Such slips of the pen would be difficult for any copyist, and even for any author, to avoid, in such a passage as this, with so many lines alliterating in *f*, and Favel fair speech, and Fals fickle tongue, constantly succeeding one another.

This is not a mere surmise, put forth for the sake of argument; it is a demonstrable fact. The same confusion between these two names, the same use of the one instead of the other, do not occur only in text B, but also in text C, and also in text A itself: one more kind of mistake which, if it demonstrates anything, can only show a similitude of authorship. In version A, II, the feoffment is said, on l. 58, to be made by Fals, and three lines farther on by Favel; Fals is a mistake for Favel. In version C, we are told,

in passus III, l. 25, that "Favel was hure fader," and on l. 121, that "Fals were hure fader."

The intention to make it Favel throughout, in B as well as C, is, however, certain: Fals in these texts continues to be the prospective husband and therefore cannot be the father; Wrong is no longer mentioned in either, so that there is only left Favel, correctly mentioned as such in C, III, 25. The same intention to give Meed a different parentage, better justifying Theology's otherwise ludicrous remarks, is also shown by Langland adding in B a mention that Meed had "Amendes" for her mother, a virtuous character, and the point is further insisted on in C: Meed's marriage cannot be valid without her mother's consent—

Amendes was hure moder by trewe mennes lokyng;
Without hure moder Amendes Mede may noght be wedded.¹

The author of B has certainly neither "misunderstood" nor spoilt A in this passage; just the reverse; he made sense of what was very near being nonsense.

—"In II, 74 ff., B does not understand that the feoffment covers precisely the provinces of the Seven Deadly Sins, and by elaborating the passage spoils the unity of intention."

That B, on the contrary, understood perfectly that the Seven Deadly Sins were in question is shown by the fact that he took notice of only six appearing in A at this place, and that he added the seventh. He gives some supplementary details on each of the sinful "erledomes" or "lordeships" bestowed on the couple, the "chastlets" and "countes" these territories include. The unity of intention is in no way impaired.

—"In II, 176, B has forgotten that the bishops are to accompany Meed to Westminster and represents them as borne 'abrode in visytynge.'"

The answer is (1) B had no chance to *forget* any such thing, as he was, without any doubt, working with a text of A at his elbow. When he wrote his l. 176, he had before him l. 151 in A. (2) Contrary to what Professor Manly suggests, there is here no incoherency chargeable to B. In A, exactly as in

¹ C, III, 122.

B, Langland indulges in an incidental fling at bishops; no more in one case than in the other were they to go to Westminster at all. In A, Civil gives advice how each steed should be "dight;" deans and subdeans will be used "as destersers,"

For thei schullen beren bisschops and bringen hem to reste;

which may mean anything one pleases, except the implying of a tumultuous journey to Westminster or anywhere else. Of Westminster not a word; and when, in version A, we reach that place with Fals and his crew, nothing is said of any bishop being part of the troop. In B, we have the same speech of Civil, with a few more details: deans and subdeans will be saddled with silver,

To here bischopes aboute abroad in visytynge.

As this fling at bishops had, in both texts, nothing to do with the story, the author, revising his poem for the last time, suppressed it entirely in text C, a not isolated example of good taste given then by him.

—"Worst of all, perhaps, B did not notice" the shifted passage on Robert and Restitution, and the introduction into the text of the names of the wife and children of Piers, at a place (A, VII, 71-74) where they interrupt Piers's speech before his journey.

This has been answered before.

VI

Professor Manly, it will be remembered, holds that the Visions were written by five different men; version A being the work of three, versions B and C of one each. We have discussed his theories concerning John But and the author of B, this last being the one about whom he took most pains. Besides the arguments enumerated above, he put forth some more concerning this same version; but as they apply also to the differences of authorship said to be discernible in the rest of the work, all these can be discussed together.

These arguments are drawn from differences in literary merit, in opinions, meter, and dialect noticeable in the successive versions of *Piers Plowman*. Those differences are, according to

Mr. Manly, so considerable that it is impossible to explain them "as due to such changes as might occur in any man's mental qualities and views of life in the course of thirty or thirty-five years, the interval between the earliest and latest versions."¹ In other words, all successive versions of any given work, or any separate part therein, showing such differences as we find in *Piers Plowman*, are proved by experience to be due to different authors; therefore the two parts of A (we exclude John But and his few lines) and the versions B and C are, in spite of the indications to the contrary supplied by MSS, and of all corroborating evidence, the work of four separate authors.

It is easy to show that this is not, in any way, a telling argument. Not only have the differences between the various versions of our poem been, as I think, greatly exaggerated, but, taking them at Professor Manly's own estimation, they would prove, in themselves, nothing at all, for a large number of works of every date and from every country can be quoted offering even deeper differences, and differences often occurring in a much shorter space of time; and yet the whole is indisputably the work of one single author, who had simply changed his mind, or his manner, or both, or was better inspired at one time than at another.

The differences in meter and dialect need not detain us much. They are mentioned "pour mémoire," rather than discussed by Mr. Manly, and we must wait till the case is put forth with an attempt at demonstration. We do not think that, when it is, it will prove at all a difference of authorship. Concerning dialects, it is very difficult to distinguish, in cases like this, what is attributable to the author and what to the scribe. Mr. Manly tells us that a careful study of the MSS would show that, "between A, B, and C, there exist dialectal differences incompatible with the supposition of a single author. This can easily be tested in the case of the pronouns and the verb *are*" (p. 34). But we find as great differences between the various copies of the *same* version; and shall we have to believe that each copy was the work of a different poet? Take a pronoun, as Mr. Manly suggests; we shall find, for example, that in one MS of version C, the pronoun *she* appears

¹ *Cambridge History*, II, p. 4.

as 30, in another MS of the same version as *hue*, in another as *sche* and *scheo*.¹ Yet the first two MSS not only give the same version, but belong to the same subclass and are very closely connected; dialectal forms are none the less markedly different.² The excellent Vernon MS of A has southern forms which do not appear in other MSS of the same version. The MS 79 at Oriel College, containing text B, is pure Midland; the MS of the same text, Dd. 1. 17, at the University Library, Cambridge, offers northern forms.

Metrical differences tell even less, not only because, here again, scribes may have had something to do with them (we have, for example, a MS of A whose scribe was so fond of alliteration that he often modified the text to add, against all rule, a fourth alliterating word³), but because, if we admitted that changes of this sort proved differences of authorship, we would have to admit that two different Miltons wrote *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*,⁴ and that 37 different Shakespeares wrote Shakespeare's 37 plays. "Let us first take the point of metre," says Dr. Furnivall in his just-published *Life* of the great dramatist, "in which Shakspeare was changing almost play by play, during his whole life."⁵ Prof. Manly states that, between the two parts of A, admitted by all critics to have been written at some years' distance in time, there are notable differences "in regard to run-on lines and masculine endings."⁶ This would show that the *Tempest* cannot be from the same Shakespeare as *Love's Labour's Lost*, since there is one run-on line for every three in the first, and one for every eighteen in the second, and there are 1,028 riming lines in

¹ MSS Laud, 656, Bodleian; Phillipps, 8, 231; University Library, Cambridge, Ff. 5. 35.

² A striking example of the close connection between these two MSS of the same version, and also of the persistence of scribes in adhering to their own private dialectal forms, is given by Skeat, Preface of C, p. xxix (Early Engl. Text Soc.): the scribe of the Phillipps MS having written once by mistake *hue* instead of *he*, the scribe of the Laud MS "actually followed suit by substituting his favorite form 30, not noticing that *hue* was wrong."

³ MS of Lincoln's Inn, version A; Skeat, Preface of A, p. xxii.

⁴ "The difference in kind between the two poems is signalised in certain differences in the language and versification."—D. Masson, *Milton's Poetical Works*, Introduction to *Paradise Regained*.

⁵ Furnivall and Munro, *Shakespeare's Life and Work*, 1908, p. 66. Cf. pp. 90, 114, 137, 147, and the tables, p. 263.

⁶ *Cambridge History*, II, p. 18.

Love's Labour's Lost, and only two in the *Tempest* (and none in *Winter's Tale*).

Concerning differences of literary merit and mental power, Prof. Manly declares that the first part of A (episodes of Meed and Piers) is the best in the whole work; and not only the best, for after all it must happen to any author that one of his poems or cantos is his best, but so far above all the rest as to imply a difference of authorship. Those first eight passus are remarkable, he says, for their "clearness and definiteness and structural excellence;" they are conspicuous for their "unity of structure;" the writer never "forgets for a moment the relation of any incident to his whole plan. . . . Only once or twice does he interrupt his narrative to express his own views or feelings. . . . There is nowhere even the least hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a class." The style is of unparalleled "picturesqueness and verve;" the art of composition is "one of the most striking features," of this portion of the poem.¹

In the latter part of A, on the contrary, that is the Dowel passus, and in the additions introduced into versions B and C, those qualities disappear to a large extent; we have much more "debate and disquisition" than "vitalised allegory" (why not?); the author is interested in casuistry, in theological problems, predestination, etc. (again, why not?); the "clearness of phrasing, the orderliness and consecutiveness of thought . . . are entirely lacking."² The author of B has the same defects to an even more marked degree; he is incapable of "consecutive thinking;" his "point of view is frequently and suddenly and unexpectedly shifted; topics alien to the main theme intrude because of the use of a suggestive word;"³ he, too, shows interest in predestination (which in any case brings him near one of the supposed authors of A); he cannot follow his plan properly.

As a matter of fact, there are no such wide differences. Great as are the merits of the first part of A, written with all the vigor and vivacity of younger manhood, they are mixed with the very kind of faults Mr. Manly detects in the second part and in the successive versions. Incoherencies are numerous and glaring; the

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 5, 11, 12.

² Pp. 17, 18.

³ P. 24.

aptitude to start off on a new track because a mere word has evoked a new thought in the writer's mind is remarkable, and in this we can find once more his seal and signature, the proof of his authorship. None of the stories lead to anything, to anywhere, nor are in any way concluded.

Let us glance, as we are bidden, at the first part of version A, beginning with passus I. The dreamer asks a "lovely ladi," who turns out to be Holy Church, to interpret the dream of the two castles and the field full of folk, which he has had in the prologue. The Lady answers in substance: The tower on this toft is the place of abode of Truth, or God the father; but do not get drunk. Why drunk, and why those details about drunkenness that has caused Lot's sins, the nature of which is recalled? The word *drink* having come under the pen of the author, he started off on this subject and made it the principal topic (eight lines) in Holy Church's answer, though it had nothing to do with the dream she had been requested to interpret.

The dreamer thanks her very much, and asks now what is this money that these men are treasuring up and "so fast holden." The Lady makes a somewhat rambling answer, both question and answer being equally unexpected and irrelevant. The "feld ful of folk" in the prologue had been represented as filled with men who ploughed the land, prayed, glosed on the gospel, overfed themselves, pleaded before the courts, traded, did, in fact, all sorts of things, except hold fast "moneye on pis molde."

What the Lady should have explained was not hard to make clear. The subject of the dream in the prologue was nothing else than what the author must have seen in reality a number of times, namely, the world as represented in a mystery play, just as we may see it pictured in the MS of the Valenciennes Passion:¹ on one side, God's Tower or Palace; on the opposite side, the devil's castle, "pat dungen . . . pat dredful is of siht," says Langland; between the two, a vast space for the various scenes in man's life or in the story of his salvation. It is simple, but the Lady loses her way, and the only people she describes are those that just happen not to have been there.

¹ Reproduced, e. g., in my *Shakespeare in France*, p. 63.

Asked by the dreamer, who has apparently ceased to care about the people in his dream, how he could be saved, the Lady advises him to think only of Truth; clerks "*scholde techen*" what Truth is. But this word *scholde* has caused the author's mind to wander, and instead of enlightening her hearer on his duties, the Lady begins to describe what other sorts of people "should" do, and especially a sort very far removed from the dreamer's condition, namely kings and knights; the Lady informs us that they "*scholde kepen hem bi Reson*." Kings in general remind her of King David in particular, and David and his knights remind her of Crist, who is the king of heaven, and of angels who are his knights; we have therefore something about angels, some of whom are good and others are bad, as witness Lucifer about whom we now get various details.

The poem continues as it began; the experience might be prolonged indefinitely. The dreamer insisting to know what is Truth, the Lady says that it consists in loving God more than oneself, but the word *love* having evoked a new train of thoughts, the poet descants now on the necessity of having "*reupe on pe pore*;" if you do not "*love pe pore*" you cannot be saved, even if you have been as chaste as a child; but the word *chaste* starting a new idea, the author branches off on this topic: to be chaste is not enough; "*moni chapeleyens ben chast*," yet lack charity, and so on.

None of the visions, episodes, or stories in these passus have any ending, nor are continued by what comes next. After the field full of folk, interpreted in the way we have seen by Holy Church, after the dreamer's appeal to know how he can be saved, we have the story of Meed and of her intended nuptials with Fals. A question of the dreamer how to know "the Fals," of which Fals not a word had been said before, is all there is of "structural excellence" in the connecting of the two episodes. Theology objects to Meed's marriage; the case is brought before the King who wants to give her hand to the Knight Conscience. Conscience refuses, makes a speech, and consents at last to kiss Meed, provided Reason agrees he should. Reason is brought forth, makes a speech on quite different topics, and we never hear any more of the kiss or the marriage. "*Dene Pees com to parlement*;" a new episode

begins, the word "pene" being all that connects it with the previous one. And so on, till the end.

Worthy of the profoundest admiration as Langland is, he deserves it for qualities quite different from that "structural excellence" which Professor Manly thinks he discovers in version A and in no other. In this version, in version B, and in version C—the same combination of qualities and defects denoting the same man—the poet's mind is frequently rambling and his poem recalls rather the mists on "Malverne hulles" than the straight lines of the gardens at Versailles.

Another difference mentioned by Professor Manly is that only "once or twice" the author of the first part of A interrupts his narrative to express his own views. Here again the difference with the other versions is remarkably exaggerated. We find in A, such passages as those beginning: "Bote god to alle good folk" III, 55;¹ "Bote Salamon pe Sage" III, 84 (the author interferes in these two cases to give the lie to his own personages); "I warne ȝou, alle werk-men" VII, 306; "ȝe Legistres and Lawyers" VIII, 62; "For-thi I rede ȝow renkes (creatures) And nomeliche, ȝe Meires. . . ." VIII, 168. Here are, in any case, five examples instead of "one or two." The Langland who wrote A resembled too much, in reality, the Langland who wrote B and C to be able to resist the temptation to interfere, interrupt, and make direct appeals to his compatriots—to you mayors, you lords, you workmen—whom he wanted so much to convert. All these Langlands, so strangely similar, cared little for art, as compared with moral improvement.

We have been told also that there is nowhere in A "even the least hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a

¹The intervention of the author in this case interrupts the story of Meed who has just been heard by her confessor, and has been promised absolution if she gives a glass window to the church. The author expresses his personal indignation at such doings, and beseeches "you, lordynges," not to act thus; lords make him think of mayors, and the word mayor recalls to him the duties of such dignitaries; in his usual rambling fashion, the poet passes on accordingly to the duty for mayors to punish "on pillories" untrustworthy "Brewesters, Bakers, Bochers and Cookes;" and when we return at last to Meed, as the author had just been speaking of mayors, he makes her address "ȝe meir," though none had been mentioned, and there was none there before. Here again there is no cause for praising A's "structural excellence."

class." In this, too, I must confess I do not see great differences between any of the Visions; the same deep antipathies appear in A as elsewhere: scorn for idle people of whatever sort, strong animosity against lawyers carried to the point of absolute unfairness,¹ contempt for pardoners, pilgrims, and all those who think that, by performing rites, they can be saved, scorn and disgust for friars, who are constantly mentioned with contumely, and certainly not as individuals but as a class; the whole lot of them ("all pe foure ordres," the poet is careful to say) are, like the lawyers, condemned wholesale.²

If the merits of the first part of A have been, as I consider, exaggerated, so have the demerits of the second part and of the two revisions. The second part of A has, it is true, more dull places than the first: no author is constantly equal to his best work. But even in this portion of the poem, we find passages of admirable beauty, such as Langland alone produced in these days; the one, for example, where he tells us of his doubts, and of his anguish at his inability to reconcile the teachings of the Church with his idea of justice. Aristotle—"who wrouȝte betere?"—is held to be damned; and Mary Magdalen—"who miȝte do wers?"—as well as the penitent thief, with his whole life of sin behind him, are saved. Happy those who do not try to know so much, who do not feel those torments; happy the "pore peple, as plouȝmen" who can (and what a grand line!)—

Percen with a *pater-noster* the paleis of hevene.³

The value of the most picturesque and humorous scenes in the rest of the poem fades in comparison with passages of this

¹The author cannot admit that a lawyer's work deserves a salary as well as any other kind of work; he would like them to plead "for love of ur Lord," and not for "pons and poundes" (Prol. 85).

²

I font here Freres' all be Foure Ordres,
Preching be peple for profyt of heore wombes.
—A, Prol. 55.

Friars receive Fals; they open their house to Lye and keep "him as a Frere" (II, 206); Meed's confessor who is a model of low rascality is "i-copet as a Frere" (III, 36); Envy wears the "fore slevys" of "a Freris frokke" (V, 64, etc.). The fact that a copy of *Piers Plowman* belonged to a friars' convent has no bearing on the question; Wyclifite Bibles were also found in convents.

³A, end of passus X.

sort. Others, of a different stamp, might be quoted, such as the brief and striking portrait of Wit, the model man of learning:

He was long and lene' to loken on ful symple,
Was no pride on his apparail' ne no povert nober,
Sad of his semblaunt' and of softe speche.¹

What has been said of the differences between the two parts of A cannot but be emphatically repeated for what concerns those supposed to exist between A and B. Given the time elapsed, as shown by the political allusions, those differences, if any there be, are far from striking. A remarkable point deserves attention at the start. As acknowledged by Professor Manly himself, the author of B makes excellent, vivid, and picturesque additions to the first two episodes (stories of Meed and of Piers Plowman), and introduces abstract, discursive, and scarcely coherent ones in the Dowel part; in other words B is, from this point of view, an exact counterpart of A, the picture being simply drawn on a larger scale. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that men so similarly impressed and influenced by similar topics were not improbably the same man.

In reality, defects and qualities bring the three versions very near one another. Professor Manly tells us that the author of B is in "helpless subjection to the suggestions of the words he happens to use;" so is, as we have seen, the author of A. The author of B "loses sight of the plan of the work;" so does A. B, Mr. Manly continues, shows perhaps as much power as A in "visualising detail;" but he is "incapable of visualising a group or of keeping his view steady enough to imagine and depict a developing action."² One may be permitted to ask what is the crowd which B ought to have described, and which he failed to visualise? Of the perfection of his power of observation and the picturesqueness of his style some examples have been given; many others might be added; and the famous rat-parliament, one of the most characteristic and best "visualised" scenes in the poem, is present in everybody's memory.

As for his incapacity to understand the development of an action, B shows certainly, by the suppression of Wrong as father

¹ A, IX, 110.

² *Cambridge History*, p. 32.

of Meed, the giving of "Amendes" to her as a mother, and the other modifications in the passage, that he well understood how an action should develop. C shows it even better by the suppression of the lines telling, in previous versions, how Piers tore up his bull of pardon out of spite, and simply because contradiction had irritated him. This is one of the grandest, if not the grandest scene in the poem, the most memorable, even for us to-day, the culminating point of the work. "Pleyn pardoun" is granted to ploughmen and other poor people who have led hard lives on this earth without murmuring; it is the recompense of their humility; the Lord gives it to them "for love of heore lowe hertes."¹ Piers, can we see your pardon?

And Pers at his preyere the pardon unfoldeth,
 And I bi-hynden hem bothe bi-heold al the bulle.
 In two lines hit lay and not a lettre more,
 And was i-written riht thus in witnesse of treuthe:
Et qui bona egerunt ibunt in vitam eternam;
Qui vero mala, in ignem eternum.

It is only in revising his text for the last time that the author felt how greatly improved the whole episode would be if cut short here, that the action was now fully developed, and that any addition, and especially the tearing of the bull by Piers whose main treasure it should have been, simply spoilt it. He therefore suppressed this incident, twenty-six lines in all, and having briefly shown by the priest's remark that such a teaching was too high for vulgar ecclesiastics, he tells us he awoke as the sun was setting in the south, and he found himself

Meteles and moneyles on Malverne hulles.²

If the vague subject of Dowel, Dobet, Dobest, inspires the author of B and C with as much rambling as the author of the second part of A, it inspires him, too, with several of those splendid touches of eloquence and feeling which also shine in that same second part—and nowhere else in the literature of the day.

¹ A, VIII, 87 ff.

² C, X, 295.

There we find, for example, added in version B, the incomparable prayer to the Creator, in passus XIV:

Ac pore peple, thi prisoneres' lorde, in the put of myschief,
 Conforte tho creatures' that moche care suffren
 Thorw derth, thorw drouth' alle her dayes here,
 Wo in wynter tymes' for wantyng of clothes,
 And in somer tyme selde' soupn to the fulle;
 Conforte thi careful' Cryst, in thi ryche,
 For how thow confortest alle creatures' clerkes bereth witesse,
*Convertimini ad me et salvi eritis.*¹

In version B also we find, for the first time, the great passus on "Crystes passioun and penaunce,"² with the author awakening at the end, to the sound of Easter bells, not saddened and anxious, as formerly while the sun was going down on Malvern hills, but cheered and joyful on the morning of the Resurrection. It is difficult to read such passages, so full of fervor, so sincere, and so eloquent, without thinking of Dante or Milton—unless one chooses to think of Langland alone.

VII

Studying text C apart from the others, Professor Manly points out certain traits special to it and marking it, he believes, as the work of a separate author. Two examples are quoted by him of "C's failure to understand B" (p. 33); other instances, we are told, might be given, but these are doubtless the most telling ones. The first example consists in a comparison of ll. 11-16 in the prologue of B with the similar expanded passage forming ll. 9-18 in C, passus I. Professor Manly considers the picture entirely spoilt. Be it so; the case, as we shall see, would be far from a unique one; more than one author spoilt, in his old age, the work of his youth. But it is not certain that it is so, and many, I think, would not willingly lose the new line added there to broaden the spectacle offered to the view of the dreamer who sees before him:

Al the welthe of this worlde' and the woo bothe.

The second example is the change introduced in ll. 160-66 of the Prologue in B (episode of the Rat Parliament). The "raton

¹ B, XIV, 174.

² B, XVIII; C, XXI.

of renon" suggests that a bell be hung to the neck of the cat: there are certain beings in "the cite of London," who bear bright collars and go as they please "bothe in wareine and in waste;" if there was a bell to their collar, men would know of their coming and run away in time. Clearly, according to Mr. Manly, those beings, those "segges," are dogs, and C made a grievous mistake in supposing them men; he cannot therefore be the author of B.

But in reality they *were* men. C made no mistake, and, on the contrary, improved the passage. The allusions were incoherent in B. What were those beings, living in London, roaming in warrens, and wearing collars, whom if a bell were added to their collars, *men* would be able to avoid?

Men myȝte wite where thei went' and awei renne.

The author of C very justly felt that the passage should be made clearer; he had, of course, never intended really to mean dogs (from which people are not accustomed to run away) but men, those very "knyȝtes and squiers" whom he now names for our clearer understanding, and who had taken then to wearing costly gold collars—a well-known fashion of the period—being themselves the very sort of "segges" the poorer people might have reason to fear. He therefore names them and no one else, and is careful to suppress the allusion in B to their appearing so adorned "in wareine and in waste." There was no "misunderstanding" on the part of C; just the reverse; and he deserves thanks instead of blame.

Considering this version as a whole, Professor Manly describes the author as having been, so it seems to him, "a man of much learning, true piety, and of genuine interest in the welfare of the nation, but unimaginative, cautious, and a very pronounced pedant." This amounts to saying, as everybody will agree, that C is the work of an older man than A and B, which simply confirms the point of view I defend. Increasing piety, more care for politics, more cautiousness, less imagination, a greater show of learning (in the last edition he gave of his *Essays*, Montaigne added about two hundred Latin quotations¹) are so many characteristics of age, none of them implying a difference of authorship.

¹ P. Villey, *Les sources des Essais de Montaigne*, Paris, 1908, Vol. I, p. 402.

It is an untoward circumstance for Mr. Manly's theory that his successive writers seem to have been each one older than his predecessor, just as if the same man had been living to revise his own work.

Concerning the textual changes and additions in C, Mr. Manly declares that "they are numerous and small, and not in pursuance of any well-defined plan. There are multitudinous alterations of single words and phrases, sometimes to secure better alliteration, sometimes to get rid of an archaic word, sometimes to modify an opinion, but often for no discoverable reason, and occasionally resulting in positive injury to the style or the thought" (p. 30). Precisely; and this is what an author, in the evening of life, would do for his own work and what no one else would; a reviser would have undertaken the work for some cause and with "a well-defined plan." At times, says Professor Manly, "one is tempted to think that passages were rewritten for the mere sake of rewriting." Just so, and who, except the author himself, would take so much trouble? An absolutely parallel case is offered by no less a man than Ronsard, who revised his whole works and gave one last edition of them in 1584, the year before his death. The changes introduced by him are of such a nature that they can be described as follows: "There are multitudinous alterations of single words and phrases, sometimes to secure better [cadence], sometimes to get rid of an archaic word, sometimes to modify an opinion, but often for no discoverable reason, and occasionally resulting in positive injury to the style or the thought," this latter mishap being far more frequent with Ronsard than with Langland, and the friends of the French poet deploring, in his own day, his unfortunate changes.¹

Mr. Manly considers that the author of C shows not only more pedantry in increasing the number of quotations, but more learning: "C is a better scholar than either the continuator of A (who translated *non mecaberis* by 'slay not' and *tabescebam* by 'I said nothing') or B (who accepted without comment the former of these errors)." One might well answer that there is nothing extraordinary in a student knowing more in his later years than

¹ See, e. g., Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, Book VI, chap. vii.

in his youth. But, in reality, scholarship is here out of the question, and the utmost that can be said, in view of the knowledge displayed everywhere else by the same writer, is that when he wrote *mecaberis* and *tabescebam*, the analogy of sounds evoked in his mind the thought of *mactabis* and *tacebam*. Revising his text he noticed one of these *misprints* and forgot the other; but he noticed that one too in his next edition and corrected it: exactly what could be expected from a poet, who draws, in version A, two lists of the Seven Sins, both wrong, and corrects them when writing B, adding, however, in this version another list of the Seven Sins, equally wrong. It cannot certainly be pretended that our author was a man of minute accuracy, for, as Mr. Skeat has observed, "he cites St. Matthew when he means St. Luke, and St. Gregory when he means St. Jerome,"¹ which is worse than to have left uncorrected, or even to have written, *tabescebam* instead of *tacebam* and *Fals* instead of *Favel*. If one of the versions had shown minute accuracy throughout, that would have told, in a way, for the theory of multiple authorship; but we find nothing of the kind, and the last list of the Seven Sins is left in C definitively wrong.

VIII

Such is, as I take it, the truth concerning the supposed differences between the three versions. But let us, as a counter experiment, admit that it is not so, and let us accept all those differences at Professor Manly's own estimation. In order that they prove anything, experience must have shown that whenever similar ones are detected in the various revisions or the various parts of a work, a multiple authorship is certain.

To say nothing of Chaucer and of his tales of the Clerk, the Miller, and the Parson, we would have, if this theory held good, to admit that the first three acts of *Hamlet* were written by one Shakespeare, and the two last by another—an obvious fact: note the differences of merit, so much genius and so little, the glaring discrepancies between the two parts, Hamlet slim and elegant, the "mould of fashion" in the first acts, fat and asthmatic in the

¹ Preface of B, p. xiv (E. E. T. S.).

last; remember our being told that Hamlet has "foregone all customs of exercise" since Laertes left, and later that, since Laertes went, he has been "in continual practice;" Laertes himself, a brave and honorable young man in the first acts, a cowardly murderer at the end, and so on. As Professor Manly says concerning the separate poet to whom he attributes the second part of A, the author of the latter part of the play "tried to imitate the previous writer, but succeeded only superficially, because he had not the requisite ability as a writer, and because he failed to understand what were the distinctive features in the method of his model."¹ It even seems, at times, as if the author of the two last acts had never read the three first: dual authorship should therefore be held as more than proved.

The whole story of literature will have to be rewritten: strong doubts will be entertained whether the revised version of the *Essays* of 1588 is really by Montaigne, the differences with the former ones offering some remarkable analogies with those pointed out in *Piers Plowman*.² There will be a question as to the first part of *Don Quixote* being by the same Cervantes as the last,³ and *Paradise Regained* by the same Milton as *Paradise Lost*. But this is nothing: here is a grand poem, of great originality, full of love and adventures, revealing withal the highest aims; a masterpiece received at once as such and ever since. And we have also a revision, the work obviously of a feebler hand, of a less gifted genius, a cautious man, very pedantic. All that was best and most original in the first text has been suppressed or toned down; the subject is modern, yet we now find that the character of

¹ *Cambridge History*, p. 17.

² In the first edition of the *Essays* (to quote an opinion not at all expressed in view of the present discussion, as it dates from 1897) the thought of Montaigne "est hardie dans l'expression; elle a le ton haut et résolu de celui qui s'émancipe. Plus tard, au contraire, elle baissera la voix, comme on la baisse pour dire des choses graves dont on sait la portée." In his same last version, Montaigne "disjoint ses raisonnements, coupe le fil de ses déductions, on y intercalant des remarques étrangères; la pensée primitive se morcele ainsi et se désagrège. . . . Son livre est devenu pour Montaigne une sorte de tapisserie de Pénélope, qu'il ne défait certes pas, car il retranche peu, mais dont il relâche les mailles, y travaillant toujours sans l'achever jamais."—Paul Bonnefon, in Jullien's *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, III, 454, 468.

³ "A certain undertone of melancholy has been perceived in his second part. . . . At times he moralise[s] with that touch of sadness natural to a man of many years and trials, for whom life is only a retrospect."—T. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Introduction to his reprint of Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, London, 1896, Vol. III, p. xxiv.

the hero has been so remodeled as to recall Achilles; other personages are so modified as to resemble Hector, Nestor, Patrocles. Here are indeed differences! Yet we should be wrong in assuming that the *Gerusalemme Liberata* and the *Gerusalemme Conquistata* are the work of several Tassos.

Here is another work, and the analogy is even closer; it is an English masterpiece. It appeared in one volume, full of the most interesting and best "visualised" scenes, every incident so well presented and so true to life as to be unforgettable, the book attaining at once an immense popularity, being translated into every language, and keeping to this day its hold on readers throughout the world. We are confronted with two continuations. The earliest is a weak imitation of the first work, the visual power has diminished; strange happenings of the usual kind are expected to make up for the lack of better qualities; it is impossible to stop reading the first part when once begun, it is difficult to read the second to its end. In the next continuation, the differences are yet deeper, the author makes faint attempts to connect his work, by allusion, with the first one, but all has become vague and allegorical; theological mists have replaced tangible realities. Afraid apparently of detection, the author of this part goes so far as to pretend that the first one was "allegorical," though also "historical": a barefaced slander on the original work. The new part is full of rambling disquisitions on man and his duties, on atheism, and on Providence, with an imaginary journey to the world of spirits and a visit to Satan: "Here, I say, I found Satan, keeping his court or camp, we may call it which we please." The conclusion of the book is, that "a great superintendency of divine Providence in the minutest affairs of this world," and the "manifest existence of the invisible world" have been demonstrated. A difference of authorship is the more obvious that there was not between the publications of these three volumes, anonymous all of them, a lapse of years allowing the author to become, so to say, a different man: it did not take two years for the three to appear.

Yet, for all that, the three were the work of the same writer, and the titles he gave to them were: *Life and strange surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*—*Farther Adventures of Robin-*

son Crusoe—*Serious Reflections . . . of Robinson Crusoe, with his Vision of the Angelick World.* The first part appeared in 1719, the last in 1720. Shall we have to believe in three different Defoes?

IX

I mentioned at the outset that all the indications in the MSS, whether titles of the different parts, colophons, or notes added by former day owners, agreed in showing that we had to do with a single work, the work of a single author; none to the contrary being discernible. One more connecting link between the three versions remains to be noticed.

At various places in each, and with more abundance as time passed, the author gave some details about himself, his train of thoughts, and his manner of life. All these details are simple, plain, clear, most of them of no interest whatever, if untrue; they are not meant to show the poet to advantage, but have, on the contrary, often the tone of a confession: *video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*. Localities are mentioned with a precision and definiteness unequaled in the ample dream-literature of that period, where poets usually go to sleep by the side of an anonymous brook, in a nameless country. Here two regions, one a very unusual one in poetry, are named so as to draw special attention, Malvern with her hills, her mists, and the vast plain at the foot of the slopes; London, with its cathedral of many chantries, its great people wearing bright collars, its poorer ones in their "cots," its principal thoroughfares and suburbs, Cornhill, Cheapside, Cock Lane, Garlickhithe, Tyburn, Southwark, Shoreditch, where lives "dame Emme," Westminster with the king's palace and the law courts. The allusions to Welshmen confirm the inference that Malvern is not a name chosen at random, as the author expresses such ideas as would occur to a man of the Welsh border. They are natural in such a one, and would be much less so in a Kentish or Middlesex man. There is in Chaucer one mention of Wales: it is to describe it as the refuge of Christians during the period of the old-time invasions:

To Walis fled the cristianitee.¹

¹ *Man of Law*, l. 446.

Gower mentions Wales, but only to say that it was the place from which came the bishop who baptized King Allee.¹

All those personal notes, scattered in versions belonging, as everybody acknowledges, to dates far apart, accord quite well one with another. If Mr. Manly's four anonymous authors are responsible for them, they showed remarkable cleverness in fusing into one their various personalities, to the extent even of growing more talkative, "cautious," and "pedantic," as years passed, so as to convey the impression of the same man growing older—the more meritorious, too, as the taking-up of somebody else's work to revise it, is rarely a task assumed at the end of one's life, so that the chances are that the supposed reviser of C was not an old man; yet he cleverly assumed Eld's habits and ways of speech.

Not only do the tone of the work and the nature of the additions denote that B was written by an older man than A, and C by an older man than B, but the fact is expressly stated in the course of the private confidences added in each version. At the beginning of passus XII in B, Ymagynatyf, besides telling us that the author has followed him "fyve and fourty wyntre" (which one is free to take literally or not), specifies that the poet is no longer young, and that he has reached middle age, though not yet old age. I have often moved thee to think of thy end, says Ymagynatyf,

And of thi wylde wantounesse² tho thou ȝonge were,
To amende it in thi myddel age³ lest miȝte the faylled
In thyne olde elde.²

In C, written many years later, the "fyve and fourty wyntre," which could no longer be even approximately true, are replaced by the vague expression "more than fourty wynter," and in the long and very interesting passage, reading like a sort of memoirs, added at the beginning of passus VI, the author speaks of himself as "weak," and of his youth as being long passed:

"Whanne ich ȝong was," quath ich "meny ȝer hennes . . ."³

¹ *Confessio Amantis*, II, l. 904.

² B, XII, 6. "Concupiscentia Carnis" had told him, it is true: "Thow art ȝongge and ȝepe and hast ȝeres ynowe" (XI, 17). But this occurs in a passage where Fortune shows to the author, in a mirror called "mydlerd" (earth or the world), an allegory of man's whole life; it is therefore preserved in C. It may also be observed that it agrees with the character of "Concupiscentia Carnis" to speak thus to men of *any* age.

³ C, VI, 35.

How extraordinary is such minute care, in four different anonymous authors, who cannot have acted in concert, as each must have died to allow the other to do his revising unimpeded! such minute care, in order to give the impression of only one man revising his own work as he lived on, and grew older!—much less extraordinary, and therefore more probable, if the whole was, as I believe, the work of the same writer.

Not only do the personal intimations scattered in the three versions fit well together, but they fit such a man as would have composed such a poem, a man of enthusiasm and despondency, of a great tenderness of heart, in spite of a gaunt exterior and blunt speech, a man of many whims which he may occasionally have obeyed,¹ only to feel afterward the pangs of remorse, as if he had committed real crimes; describing himself then in the worst colors, and, what is well worthy of notice, giving throughout the impression of one who would attempt much in the way of learning without reaching complete proficiency in any branch, of one with an ungeometrical sort of mind, who could let many errors slip in the midst of his grand visions, pregnant sayings, vague dreams, and vain disquisitions. Nothing is more characteristic than the description of himself he attributes to Clergie in the very first version of the poem:

The were lef to lerne' but loth for to stodie.²

In a line added in B, he makes Holy Church recall his lack of steady zeal:

To litel latyn thow lernedest' lede, in thi zouth.³

He describes himself elsewhere as "frantyk of wittes."

On this, Mr. Manly limits himself to stating briefly that all such details must be imaginary, and he refers us to Prof. Jack who "has conclusively proved" that all these indications were fictitious. "Were any confirmation of his results needed, it

¹ Coveytyse-of-eyes' cam ofter in mynde
Than Dowel or Dobet' amonge my dedes alle.
Coveytyse-of-eyes' confortid me ofte,
And seyde, "have no conscience' how thow come to gode."

—B, XI, 49.

² A, XII, 6.

³ B, I, 139; not in A; preserved in C.

might be found in the fact that the author gives the name of his wife and daughter as Kitte and Kalote . . . typical names of lewd women, and therefore not to be taken literally as the names of the author's wife and daughter" (p. 34).

But if those names had such a meaning that part of the poem would be unintelligible anyway, whoever the author be. Those names appear in the splendid passage where the poet is awakened by the bells on Easter morn:

And kallyd Kytte my wyf and Kalote my doughter,
'A-rys, and go reverence' godes resureccioun,
And creep on kneos to the croys and cusse hit for a juwel
For goddes blissed body it bar for owre bote.¹

To say that those names are the invention of a reviser is no explanation. Why should a reviser choose them, if they had such a meaning, and what can be his intention in showing himself, at this solemn moment, surrounded with such a disreputable family?

The truth is that the opprobrious meaning thus attributed to these names at that date is a mere assumption in support of which no proof is being adduced. Names for which such a bad fate is in store always begin by being honorable; then comes a period during which they are used in the two senses; then arrives the moment of their definitive doom. The parallel French word *catin*, derived like Kitte from Catherine, was for a long time a perfectly honorable word; the second period began for it at the Renaissance; but then, and for a great many years, it was used both ways. It appears with the meaning of a strumpet in Marot:

Une catin, sans frapper a la porte,
Des cordeliers jusqu'en la cour entra.²

But the same word is used to designate the Queen of France in one of the eclogues of Ronsard: *Catin* stands there for Catherine de Médicis.³ The same name again is employed much later by Madame Deshoulières as an honorable proper name, and by Madame de Sévigné as an infamous substantive.

¹ C, XXI, 473; B, XVIII, 426.

² Ed. Janet, Vol. III, p. 105; pointed out by Paul Meyer.

³ Eclog. I, first speech of the "Premier Pasteur Voyageur." Elisabeth of France, daughter of Catherine and of Henri II, is there described as "fille de Catin."

As for *Kalote*, supposing *callet* to be really derived from it, it should be noted that the oldest example quoted in Murray's Dictionary of *callet* being used to designate "a lewd woman, trull, strumpet, drab," is of about 1500.

Except for this, we are referred, as I have said, to Prof. Jack, stated to have "conclusively proved" that nothing was genuine in the personal allusions scattered throughout *Piers Plowman*. As a matter of fact, Prof. Jack did nothing of the kind. He assumes at the start, in his essay,¹ the thoroughly skeptical attitude which is nowadays all the fashion. James I of Scotland, we were recently told, did not write the *Kingis Quhair*; Sir Philip Sidney was never in love with anybody, and his poems are literary exercises; he himself says they were not, and even names with marked animosity the husband of the lady; but that does not matter; we are not such fools and we know better. Shakespeare's dark woman never existed at all; he invented her to have the pleasure of drawing her edifying portrait. As for *Piers Plowman*, the author lets us understand that he made the very sort of studies that one must have made to write such a poem; he tells us that certain ecclesiastical functions allowed him to eke out a scant livelihood; that it happened to him to live in Malvern and in London, etc. Nonsense, all that; how could one believe that he really lived anywhere?

Yet, he probably did; poets are not bound to be always deceitful; their own private experience and real feelings are, after all, the subject-matter readiest of access to them. Why should they ever go such a long way to invent, when it would be so easy for them to copy? Of course, when they tell us tales of wonder, or of events markedly to their advantage, we should be on our guard; but when they plainly state plain facts, of small interest if untrue, contradicted by no document and by no historical fact, the chances are that they speak from experience, the personal element in the statement being precisely what makes it seem interesting to them. We are not bound to believe that a real eagle carried to the House of Fame, beyond the spheres, such a precious and consid-

¹"The Autobiographical Elements in *Piers the Plowman*," in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Bloomington (Ind.), Vol. III, 1901, No. 4.

erable load as was our friend Chaucer. But when the same Chaucer describes himself as going home after having made his "rekenynges," and reading books until his sight is "dasewyd,"¹ we would be quite wrong in displaying here any of our elegant skepticism: for it so happens that documentary evidence corroborates the poet's statements, and authentic records tell us of the sort of "rekenynges" the poet had to attend to and the kind of work which would impair his sight.

Why believe, says Prof. Jack, that our author was, in any way, connected with Malvern? He names those hills, it is true, but "of these he gives us no description." Why should he? He may have had some "personal acquaintance with London," but "certainly we cannot affirm that he ever lived there or even ever saw it."²

Well may one be skeptical about such skepticism. When, in the course of a work of the imagination, among fancy cities and real ones, we find the absolutely uncalled-for sentence: "Se transporte à Chinon, ville fameuse, voire première du monde," we would be wrong to suppose that this name has been put there at random; for the city was the birthplace of the author of the work, Rabelais. When, in the same work, we find that Pantagruel "estoit logé à l'Hostel saint Denis" in Paris, nothing would be more natural, it seems, than to suppose the name to be a chance one. Closer scrutiny has recently shown that the Hostel Saint Denis belonged to the abbot of St. Denis and housed Benedictine monks who came to Paris to study. Rabelais was a member of the order, and must have frequented this same hostel at some of his stays in Paris, hence his choice.³

Nothing more elegant, to be sure, than skepticism. Yet it should not be carried too far, for fear of hard facts giving the lie to its fancies. What more airy being than Ronsard's Cassandre, with the conventional praise of her perfections, sonnet after sonnet embodying ideas, similes, and eulogies which had done duty

¹ *House of Fame*, II, 145, 150.

² Pp. 406, 413.

³ H. Clouzot, *Modern Language Review*, July, 1908, p. 404.

numberless times from the days of Laura if not even earlier. Yet this typical creature of a poet's brain has just turned out to have been a real woman, and to have been such as Ronsard described her, with dark hair and complexion, living at Blois, and bearing in real life the romantic and unusual name of Cassandre, for she was Cassandra Salviati, an Italian.

Prof. Jack seems to have himself felt some misgivings, for which credit should be accorded him. After having started on such lines that he was nearing apace the conclusion that *Piers Plowman* had grown somehow, without having been written by any man who might have led any sort of life anywhere; after having taken the unnecessary trouble to investigate whether the author did actually sleep and have the dreams he speaks of (an investigation of the carrying capacities of Chaucer's eagle would be welcome); and after also undertaking to refute the opinion, advanced by no one, that Langland was "a professional wanderer" and "spent his life in roaming about," Prof. Jack comes to terms. And his terms are not so very unacceptable after all. He admits, as "quite probable, that in this satirical picture of the clergy of that day the poet also had in mind the struggles by which he himself rose, and was at that moment rising, above the low moral level of the churchmen about him;" that the statements concerning his being nicknamed Long Will, living in Cornhill, etc., "may be true;" that we may find "between the lines" in the poem "valuable hints for drawing a rough sketch of his life;" that he himself, Prof. Jack, should "not be understood as denying to it all autobiographical elements; the opinions, hopes, and fears of the author are surely here."¹ This is enough to enable us to maintain that Prof. Jack has not "conclusively proved" the autobiographical details in the poem to be "not genuine, but mere parts of the fiction." He has not, and does not pretend that he has.

So long as no positive text or fact contradicts the plain statements in the poem, we hold ourselves entitled to take them for for what they are given, and to consider, at the very least, that the sum of accessible evidence favors our views rather than others' skepticism.

¹ Pp. 410, 412, 413, 414.

We persist therefore in adhering to our former faith, and in rejecting the hypothesis of the four or five authors revising one single work, each taking care to write as if he was an older man than his predecessor, leaving behind him nothing else in the same style, and dying, each in succession, to make room for the next. We hold that the differences in merit, opinions, dialect, etc., do not justify a belief in a difference of authorship, and that the shifted passage so cleverly fitted in by C at its proper place, far from hurting our views, confirms them. We believe, in a word, that, as we read in one of the MSS, "William Langland made Pers Ploughman."

Before coming to an end, however, I must repeat that, strongly as I dissent from Prof. Manly's conclusions, my gratitude toward him for his discovery and my sympathy for the sincerity and earnestness of his search, equal those of any other student. It is certainly difficult to enjoy better company than Professor Manly's on the road leading to the shrine of "St. Treuth."

J. J. JUSSEBAND

WASHINGTON
November 9, 1908

THE SOURCE OF THE FOUNTAIN-STORY IN THE YWAIN

About two years ago Professor Nitze, in an article¹ whose object was to establish a new source for the *Ywain*, declared that the central point of that romance is the episode of the fountain. "The *Ywain* is what it is," he says, "by reason of the episode of the fountain. That constitutes the distinctive element of the romance, the other elements being either subsidiary or present in a greater or less degree in the other works of Crestien."² This I think is not questioned by any critic of the romance, and I heartily agree with Nitze in regard to it. But he goes on to try to prove that the source of this episode is classical, which practically implies that the main source of the *Ywain* itself is classical, since the fountain episode is the heart of it. He contends that in the episode we have a direct survival of the Arician myth of Diana. To establish this, he separates one religious custom from the Diana cult as it existed among the Romans, and by a comparison with this isolated practice tries to show that Crestien derives his fountain-story from a possible form of it that may have been carried to the northern provinces in the stream of Roman civilization. But this Roman practice, to which Nitze appeals, is not a very close parallel. It is the guarding of the sacred grove and lake of Aricia by an armed priest, who keeps watch to guard off all intruders. In course of time one makes his way in, usually a runaway slave, and challenges the priest by breaking a sacred bough near the deity's temple. A combat ensues, the victor of which is the future defender of the grove. Where in this myth is the fountain and the storm rising from the disturbance of its waters, as in the *Ywain*? Moreover, Nitze brings forward no trace whatever of the survival of the Roman custom in the north; he merely cites several authorities to prove

¹ "A New Source of the *Ywain*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 267-81.

² *Ibid.*, p. 279.

that Diana was worshiped there.¹ There is little likelihood that Crestien took his material from this myth, which is so far removed from him, and which cannot be proved to have survived in a northern form. It is much more natural to assume that the romancer would make use of material close at hand, if there were such. And there was plenty of it. The place where I found it would be the first one to turn to in the search—the collections of fountain-lore made by the mediaeval encyclopaedists, who gathered up every fountain-story written or told at that time. An examination of these stories such as I shall try to make, will show that in them are present two distinct elements, one of which is entirely classical and bears no resemblance at all to Crestien's story, and the other of which contains every feature of his story and is most probably Celtic.

A list of fourteen stock stories is here given, all of them classical, and all occurring in the majority of the encyclopaedists:

1. Fountains healing for the eyes.
2. Fountains in Africa whose waters make a sweet melody.
3. Two fountains in Boeotia, one giving memory, the other forgetfulness.
4. Two fountains, one causing fertility, the other barrenness in women.
5. Fountain whose waters make the drinkers dropsical.
6. Two fountains, one of which makes black sheep white, the other, white black.
7. Two fountains, in one of which all things sink, in the other of which all things float.
8. Fountain which changes color four times a year, becoming successively muddy, clear, blood-red, and green.
9. Fountain daily three times bitter and three times sweet.
10. Fountain putting out lighted torches near it, and lighting them again.
11. Fountain icy cold by day and boiling by night.
12. Fountain rising at sight of red.

¹ There is no proof of the survival of anything but the name of the divinity. See two articles by Waldemar Kloss on "Herodias the Wild Huntress" in *Modern Language Notes* for March and April, 1908. Diana was simply the incarnation of the Evil One, the leader of the nightly witch-dance. It was one of the classical names that were taken over in the Middle Ages and given to spirits likewise thoroughly mediaeval.

13. Intermittent fountains, running only at certain hours and on certain days.

14. Fountains changing wood to stone.

Since the encyclopaedists are generally careful to give their authorities, it is easily seen that these stories came down ultimately from Pliny by way of Solinus of the third and Isidore of Seville of the sixth century. In none of these fourteen stock stories am I able to find a single element which can be compared with Crestien. Outside of this list, however, I find one classical story which might at first appear to have some relation to the *Ywain* story. It is told by Solinus, Jaques de Vitry, and Alexander Neckham. Solinus, in describing Sicily, says: "In Hallesina regione fons, alias quietus et tranquillus, quum siletur, si insonet tibiae exsultabundus ad cantus elevatur et quasi admiretur vocis dulcedinem ultra margines intumescit."¹ But this Sicilian fountain in reality has scarcely anything in common with the *Ywain* fountain. In the latter the water-spirit is outraged and a violent storm breaks out; in the former the water is "charmed with the sweetness of the sound," and simply rises above its margin. This is all the classical material in the encyclopaedists, but it is by no means all the fountain material I have found here.² A great many other stories appear which have no roots in

¹ Cap. 5, 20.

² Some characteristics of the universal type of well-cult might be mentioned at this point; later on it will be made clear how the *Ywain* story differs from this as well as from the classical material just considered. The cult of water is as widespread as the race itself, and has certain universal characteristics not distinctive of any one place. J. G. Frazer in his *Golden Bough* (1890), p. 4, describes a tribe in New South Wales in which to produce rain the wizard goes to the bed of the creek, drops water on a round flat stone, and then conceals it. He says also in a note to his translation of Pausanias, Vol. IV, p. 383, that in Gilolo, a large island west of New Guinea, the sorcerer makes rain by dipping the branch of a particular kind of tree in water and sprinkling the ground with it. The most striking usage Frazer mentions is that of the Apache Indians, who to cause rainfall throw water on a certain point high on a rock (*Golden Bough*, p. 4). The Greek Pausanias of the second century A. D., in his *Description of Greece*, Book viii, chap. 38, gives evidence of fountain-cult there: "... and Hagno gave her name to a spring on Mt. Lycacus, which like the river Danube flows with an equal body of water winter and summer. If there is a long drought, and the seeds in the earth and the trees are withering, the priest of Lycaean Zeus looks to the water and prays; and having prayed and offered the sacrifices enjoined by custom, he lets down an oak branch to the surface of the spring, but not deep into it; and the water being stirred, there rises a mist-like vapor, and in a little the vapor becomes a cloud, and gathering other clouds to itself it causes rain to fall on the land of Arcadia." A great many other primitive or very early stories might be given, all with the same universal features. The sole object in all is the production of rain, and this is obtained by the propitiation of a divinity in the water, who is at least non-hostile.

antiquity, but spring most likely from Celtic soil. Such are the stories of bits of wood floating in wells, which would be mysteriously returned to the wells no matter to what distance carried; stories of fresh-water springs with a tide like the sea; and of wells haunted by demons who dragged men in or did them some harm. The earliest Welsh historian, Nennius, describes only five fountains, one of which is classical, the others showing strong characteristics of this new mass of material which I have just called Celtic.¹ Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *Vita Merlini* gives the entire list of classical stories, without a single other feature. The stories of Giraldus Cambrensis are in great part new,² and among his new, non-classical stories I find this very important one of a fountain in Munster, Ireland:

Est fons in Momonia, qui si tactus ab homine, vel etiam visus fuerit, statim tota provincia pluviis inundabit. Quae non cessabunt, donec sacerdos ad hoc deputatus, qui et virgo fuerit a nativitate, missae celebratione, in capella quae non procul a fonte ad hoc dignoscitur esse fundata et aquae benedictae lactisque vaccae unius coloris aspersione, barbaro satis ritu et ratione carente, fontem reconciliaverit."³

To this story Giraldus immediately adds another practically identical, except that the scene is laid not in Ireland but in Armorica:

Est fons in Armorica Britannia, similis hujus ex parte naturae. Cujus aquis in cornu bubali haustis, si petram ei proximam forte perfuderis, tempore quantumlibet sereno et a pluviis alieno, pluvias incontinenti non evades.

It will be noticed that there are these striking elements common to this story and to the *Ywain* story: first, the offended guardian of the well avenges what it considers a violation of its consecrated dwelling; second, a terrible storm springs up suddenly.⁴

¹ The Irish Nennius, however, p. 197, tells of the "Well of Sliabh Bladhma," and says of it: "If anyone gaze at it or touch it, the sky will not cease to pour down rain until mass and sacrifice are celebrated." See Giraldus Cambrensis (Rolls Series), Vol. V, p. 89, n. 2.

² In some cases the new material seems indeed to have affected his classical stories, witness the old color-changing well, which with Giraldus instead of sheep's fleece changes men's hair. And Giraldus goes on further to tell of the well that prevents gray hair, adding slyly: "Hunc autem fontem feminae frequentant."

³ *Topographia Hibernica*, dist. 2, cap. 7 and 8.

⁴ It may be well to notice that still another element in the *Ywain* story is found here—the chapel of expiation near by.

Let us for convenience call this type of story the Sudden-Storm Story. These common elements clearly distinguish the Sudden-Storm Story, as it appears in Crestien and Giraldus, from the story of the classical type, as I have already indicated, and from the universal type of well-cult also.¹ The Sudden-Storm Story next appears in Alexander Neckham,² who, however, gives it on hearsay, as if he had it from various sources, and does not localize it. He says, "Asserunt esse fontem de quo hausta aqua si projiciatur super lapidem illi fonti vicinum, oriri videtur tempestas ex ipso lapide. Constat autem multam oriri pluviam repente, cum grandine et vento vehementi. Sed unde generetur haec tempestas quis definire praesumet?" Then follows the inevitable *instructio moralis*, which was always Neckham's main object, time and place being with him of secondary importance. Jaques de Vitry gives an account in which he places our Sudden-Storm Story in Armenia: "In minori Britannia fons quidam esse refertur cuius aquae supra propinquum lapidem projectas pluvias et tonitrua provocare dicantur."³

In Gervaise of Tilbury there are two stories of this kind: "Est in provincia regni Arelatensis fons quidem pellucidus, in quem si lapidem vel lignum aut hujusce modi materiam projeceris, statim de fonte pluvia ascendit, quae projecientem totum humectat." And,

Est in Catalonia episcopatu Gerundensi, mons excelsus valde, cui nomen Cannarum accolae indiderunt. Hujus ambitus arduus et pro magna parte inaccessabilis ad ascensum, in cujus summitate lacus est, aquam continens subnigram et in fundo imperscrutabilem. Illic mansio fertur esse daemonum ad modum palatii dilatata, et janua clausa. Facies tamen ipsius mansionis, sicut ipsorum daemonum, vulgaribus est incognita ac invisibilis. In lacum si quis aliquam lapidem aut aliam projecerit materiam, statim, tanquam offensis daemonibus, tempestas erumpit.⁴

The first of these is located in Arles, and the second in Spain. To both of these places Celtic influences very probably extended.

¹ See n. 2, p. 333.

² *De naturis rerum*, Book ii, chap. 7.

³ *Historia Orientalis*, chap. xci, printed in *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover, 1611), p. 1112.

⁴ *Otia Imperialia* (ed. Liebrecht), pp. 32 and 41.

Arles is not far from Marseilles, where stood in the time of the old Gauls a Druidic grove with mysterious trees and fountains, and Catalonia on the northeast corner of Spain may very likely have received Celtic traditions from the Gauls who crossed the Pyrenees and helped colonize the Spanish march under the Franks.

Nearly all of the Sudden-Storm Stories quoted so far were written in the twelfth century, and none of them is later than the first decade of the thirteenth. The last authority I shall quote is Thomas Cantapranus, who wrote shortly before the middle of the thirteenth century. He tells our Sudden-Storm Story twice, both times locating it in Great Britain. The first version appears in the reproduction of his *De natura rerum* by Konrad von Megenberg as follows: "Ez sint prunnen in dem grozen land Britannia wenn man der wazzer geuzt auf ainer stain nahen da pei so kûnt regen und donr und wegewiter."¹ The second is given in his own words much more in detail in the *Bonum Universale de Apibus*, with the title, "De repentina tempestate, arte daemonum suscitata, dum ex fonte quodam Britanniae aqua super vicinum lapidem effunditur." The complete story goes:

Quid autem hinc sub verissima attestazione contigerit ostendamus. Fratrem Henricum Theutonicum, quondam Lectorem fratrum Praedicatorum in Colonia, virum in omni scientia cum sanetitate conspicuum, de quo superius fecimus mentionem, attestantibus fratribus, narrentem quod subjungo audiui. Cum quidam frater nobilis genere & rebus pollens, de Britanniae partibus, ordinem Praedicatorum intrasset, apud Lugdonem Galliae cum fratribus morabatur: appropinquante autem tempore professionis suae petivit a Priori suo redire ad terram suam, ut disponderet de rebus suis: & annuit Prior cum eoque iter arripuit. Cumque venissent in deserta Britanniae, dixit frater Novitius Priori suo: Vultis videre antiquum illud Britanniae miraculum? Et Prior: Quod est illud? Et frater illum ducens ad fontem lucidissimum, super quem lapis instar altaris in columnis marmoreis locabatur, aquam protinus superfudit. Nec mora, contenebrato celo, coeperunt nubes concurrere, mugire tonitrua, imbres ruere, fulgura coruscare statimque tanta inundatio facta est, ut circa locum ad leucam unam tota terra obrui videretur. Quod ut vidit Prior miratus est, & audiente dicto fratre Henrico, magistro ordinis beatae memoriae fratri Joanni Episcopo, & alii pluribus fratribus enarravit. Hoc idem

¹ *Buch der Natur* (ed. Pfeiffer, 1861), chap. viii, p. 482.

audiui a patre meo ante annos quadraginta, qui illis in partibus sub rege Richardo Angliae militavit. Haec cum dictus frater Henricus mihi & multis aliis recitaret quaesivi, unde ista fieri potuissent? Et respondit, quod arte magici, ignota modo hominibus, & ministerio daemonum, qui ad tempestates & pluvias aera possunt impellere, & concitare cum volunt, occulto tamen Dei iudicio permittente.¹

Though Thomas writes later, he indicates in more than one way that this story was current in Great Britain in the twelfth century, during the reign of Richard Cœur de Lion. He quotes as his authority for the story a certain Henry Theutonicus, whom he mentions elsewhere with great respect. Henry is referred to also by Caesarius von Heisterbach, who concludes one of his chapters with this testimony to Henry the German's reputation as an authority on stories, "Testis huius visionis est Henricus Prior Praedicatorum in Colonia, qui se eam a praedicti loci Praeposito audivisse commemorat."² This Henry was besides a man of learning, educated at Paris, and reader of theology in the Dominican college at Cologne.³ As Thomas tells us, the German had heard an account of the fountain from a man who had traveled in Great Britain, probably years before, and found the legend of the marvelous fountain thriving there as on native soil. Thomas goes on to tell us that he himself had heard the same story forty years before from his father, "who was a soldier in those parts under Richard king of England." His father must have heard it in England sometime during the short reign of Richard from 1189 to 1199. Thomas therefore brings forward two eyewitnesses of the existence of this fountain and its legend in England several years before the end of the twelfth century.⁴

It may be worth while to add here a story from an old manuscript which Hearne quotes in his edition of Robert of Gloucester.⁵ It reads, "Est fons dulcissimus in arenis maris, ubi mare cotidie

¹ Ed. George Colvener, 1627, cap. 57, No. 28, p. 559.

² *Dialogus Miraculorum*, dist. 6, cap. 37.

³ *Allgemeine deutsche Biog.*; from Quetif-Echard, Vol. I, p. 148.

⁴ Even his seventeenth-century editor, Colvener, remarks on this as making Thomas' tale superior to other versions, "Ad hoc auctor noster oculatos profert testes," he says in the Appendix, p. 157, note.

⁵ Appendix, p. 572 (Oxford, 1724): "An old folio ms in vellum given me by Richard Graves of Mickleton in Gloucestershire, Esq."

bis crescit et decrescit ad spacium fere mille pedum, et supercrescente et decrescente mari distat fons a salo septem pedes. Est lapis iuxta fontem, ad modum altaris factus in memore. In quacumque die tingitur lapis ille de aqua fontis ipsius, in eadem die foecundissime pluit." The story in this manuscript is the more curious in that it shows a degeneration of the storm into a mere rain, and introduces in a confused way another legend, that of the well with a tide like the sea. But since I cannot assign it to any particular date,¹ I can make no more use of it than to mention it as another sign that our story was localized in Great Britain.

The fact that we find this story in popular tradition before the end of the twelfth century in Great Britain, Ireland, and on the Continent where Celtic influences were most likely felt, would indicate that there was a Celtic parent-tradition from which it sprung.² If at about the time that Crestien wrote his *Yvain* a fountain-story identical with his was already current in Great Britain, it is obvious that it could not have been taken from him. There is much more in favor of the view that the dependence is not of Britain on Armorica, or of Armorica on Britain, but of all on the same common tradition. The variations of the story therefore may all be explained as the result of the independent development of the legend with each branch of the Celts. For instance, in Great Britain it did not happen to be connected with any one place, but in Armorica it was attached to the romantic Barenton in the forest of Broceliande.³ Crestien's story in the

¹ The date is most probably much later than the thirteenth century.

² The beginnings of elements of the Sudden-Storm Story may be traced even among the early Gauls. Lucan in the *Pharsalia*, 3, 399-425, describes a Druidic wood near Marseilles with its sacred dark-running fountains. And Gregory of Tours in the *Liber de gloria confessorum*, cap. 2, tells of a lake at the foot of Mount Helanus at which every year the inhabitants of the country round used to pay sacrifices for three days, and on the fourth day when they were preparing to leave, a furious storm would arise with thunder and lightning, and rain fall so heavily that they could scarce get off with their lives. ". . . Veniebant autem cum plaustris potum cibumque deferentes, mactantes animalia et per triduum epulantes. Quarta autem die cum discedere deberent, anticipabat eos tempestas cum tonitruo et cornescatione valida; et in tantum imber ingens cum lapidum violentia descendeat, ut vix se quisquam eorum putaret evadere. Sic fiebat per singulos annos." Cf. A. Bertrand, *Nos origines*, Paris, 1897.

³ Crestien was not even the first to attach it to Barenton. The earliest mention of the fountain of Barenton as such occurs in Wace, in the early part of the twelfth century, who tells us of it in his *Roman de Rou*, ll. 6439 ff. About the same time Guillaume le Breton in his *Philippis*, lib. 6, v. 445, says, "What causes produce the marvel of the fountain of

Ywain, then, is simply the continental form of this Celtic story, taken bodily into his romance, which through Crestien's popularity became the *locus classicus* for our fountain-legend.

If I am right so far in my conclusions that there was a common Celtic tradition at the root of this Sudden-Storm Story, it is only natural to suppose that some survival of it can be traced in modern legends. Such is found in Ireland, Wales, and of course in France. The legend as it exists in France and Wales has degenerated into a rain-making story, minus the storm. The later French form appears in a curious fifteenth-century manuscript entitled, "Usements et Coustumes de la forest de Breceilien." It reads,

Joignant a la forest de Barenton y a une grosse pierre que on nomme le perron de Barenton; et toutes foiz que le seigneur de Montfort vient a ladite fontaine et de l'eau d'icelle arouse et mouille le dit perron, quelque chaleur temps (qu'il fasse) il pleut si abondamment au pays que la terre et les biens estant en icelle en sont arousez et moult leur profite.

The story persists even today, for the children of Armorica throw pins into the fountain and cry, "Ris donc, fontaine de Barenton, et je te donnerai une épingle!"

The element of the disturbance of the water has survived in the village of Llanaelhaian in Wales. This village has a remarkable spring, with stone seats about for the bathers to rest on while they wait for the "troubling of the waters," which is the sudden welling-up of the waters charged with bright bubbles. A more complete Welsh survival remains in the story connected with the tarn Dulyn on Mount Snowdon. If water is dipped from the lake and thrown on the farthest out of a series of stepping-stones, it is said that rain will surely fall before night.

Broceliande? If any one draws water there and sprinkles some drops of it, clouds full of hail gather, thunder rolls, and the air is dark with thick shadows. And those who are present wish then never to have seen it at all, their stupor is so great, and fear terrifies them so much. The thing is marvellous, I grant, but it is true. Several are witnesses of it." See A. C. L. Brown in "*Ywain, A Study in the Origins of Arthurian Romance*," *Harvard Studies in Phil. and Lit.*, Vol. VIII, p. 127. He says that the question whether the fountain in the *Ywain* had already become rain-making and identified with Barenton before Crestien took up the story must remain undecided. The evidence of Wace and Guillaume decide it, however.

This story is parallel to the degenerate modern version in France, as I have before pointed out.¹

In a comparatively modern Irish story there is a strikingly complete parallel to the Barenton legend. Diarmait and Finn Mac Cumail set out in search of the latter's men carried away by a wizard, and sailed to the west until they came to a steep cliff. Diarmait climbed it and reached a beautiful plain, where stood a great tree, fruit-laden, and surrounded by a circle of pillar stones, the tallest of which rose beside a spring at the foot of a tree. Diarmait stooped to drink and as he did so heard a heavy tread; sprang up and saw nothing. This happened again. Then he caught sight of a drinking-horn on the central pillar stone and took it up. Scarcely had he drunk from it when a *gruagach* ("terrible fellow") came from the east in a coat-of-mail complete and a scarlet mantle, and angrily challenged Diarmait for his intrusion. The duel which ensued lasted all day, and in the evening the *gruagach* sprang into the well. Diarmait then killed a speckled deer in the forest and ate it. After next morning's breakfast he encountered the still angrier *gruagach* again. The same thing happened, and so on through the third day. In the evening of the fourth Diarmait put his arms around the *gruagach* and they both sank into the well. At the bottom Diarmait found the *gruagach*'s brother, and together they made war on the Knight of the Fountain and killed him. This is precisely the same incident that appears in the *Ywain*—with one difference, that the revenge of the angered guardian of the well does not take the shape of a storm, but the guardian himself comes immediately and challenges the intruder.

It is needless to say that not one of these survivals can be traced back to Crestien as a source. In fact it is most unlikely that at any point on the road back to their ultimate origin they came in contact with the *Ywain* story, for they belong to the class of folk-material, which is separated by a wide gulf from the courtly romance, of which the *Ywain* is an example. My former conclusion as to the source of the *Ywain* fountain-story, then, is

¹Also, in the *Owein* of the *Mabinogion* practically the same fountain incident occurs as in Crestien. But date and derivation of the *Mabinogion* are unsettled.

strengthened by this modern evidence. Crestien did not have to go to the classics for his legend, for the sufficient reason that at about the period of his literary activity, it was a thriving popular tradition in Great Britain, Ireland, and his own country. I have quoted several versions of it as it was told in the twelfth century, and traced survivals of it in modern folk-lore. The legend of the people had an existence and growth entirely independent of the romance, and could not have originated from the latter. On the other hand, the romancer might have easily embodied a popular tale in his work. This is what Crestien did. He took the story as he found it, and with great effect set it into the background of his courtly romance. At any rate, it is a very far cry back across the centuries to the Arician myth of Diana, even if the Sudden-Storm fountain were not well known among the people of Crestien's own time.

LOUISE B. MORGAN

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

BRYNHILD IN LEGEND AND LITERATURE

Yet we twain together
Shall wear through the ages,
Sigurd and I.

So prophesies Brynhild in the Old Norse lays of the *Poetic Edda*; and her prophecy has been fulfilled. Originating in the misty dawn of myth, legend, and poetry, the story of the Volsungs and the Niblungs has lived for many centuries, in the literatures of many lands. And Sigurd and Brynhild hold their place with Tristram and Yseult, Lancelot and Guenevere, Romeo and Juliet, Paolo and Francesca, and other "star-crossed lovers." Among the characters in the old Volsung legend Brynhild is perhaps the most striking figure. Certainly none of the others has been the source of more disputes among scholars or of greater inspiration to poets. A heroine who would live through so many centuries of literature must submit to various fortunes and strange transformations. It is interesting to travel with her down through the ages, studying her as she appears in the earliest literary treatment and in the most notable of the many compositions which the story has inspired in succeeding centuries; to see how she has developed in harmony with the interests and ideals of the times, until she appears before us today as one of the most splendid figures in Wagner's music dramas.

The story in its best-known form, approximately that found in the Icelandic *Völsunga Saga* and in Morris' and Wagner's nineteenth-century versions, runs as follows. Sigurd or Siegfried, the fearless hero, slayer of the dragon, breaks through the encircling fire which he alone can pass, and awakens Brynhild or Brünnhilde, a valkyrie sunk in magic sleep. They are united in love. But later Sigurd is caused by enchantment to forget his betrothed and to love and wed another woman, Gudrun or Kriemhild. And assuming by magic the form of his brother-in-law, Gunnar or Gunther, he wins as bride for him his own first love. When

Brynhild learns of the treason and deception practiced upon her, she causes Sigurd's murder, and kills herself, to be united in death with her beloved.

It was the fashion some years since to assign mythological origins to the old legends, this one among others. Sigurd was supposed to represent some god—Odin, Freyr, or Baldr. The story of Sigurd and Brynhild was interpreted as a summer and winter or day and night myth. Sigurd is the god of Spring, who frees the Earth goddess from her imprisonment in the castle of Winter, and with his sword, the sunbeam, cuts her free from the covering of ice.¹ Or he is the god of Light, who in the morning drives away the mist dragons and awakens the Sun sleeping upon the mount of heaven, which shines like fire in the morning glow; but in the evening he is overcome again by the powers of darkness, who bear the Sun back into their misty realms beneath the earth.² This particular episode of the hero's awakening the sleeping maiden appears in various forms in European literature and folk-tales, and is familiar still in the story of the Sleeping Beauty.³ Scholars seem inclined to admit that this episode was probably mythical in its origin.⁴ But the fashion of mythical interpretation has in the main passed away, and later writers on the subject have considered that the essential kernel of the Sigurd-Brynhild story was in its origin purely human—about mortal heroes—and that later in its development it acquired some supernatural and mythical features.⁵

Though the Sigurd-Brynhild legend probably originated among the Rhine Franks, the oldest literary treatment of it which has come down to us is the Old Norse version in the *Elder Edda*, the collection of short poems originally written probably between the ninth and twelfth centuries. The character of Brynhild in these lays is interesting and impressive, appearing in flashes of poetry,

¹ W. Jordan, *Die Edda*, p. 7; K. J. Simrock, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 487.

² Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, Vol. II, p. 25.

³ No. 50 in Grimm's *Household Tales*. See Hunt's translation, Vol. I, pp. 197 and 404.

⁴ Paul's *Grundriss*, II, p. 25; H. Lichtenberger, *Le poème et la légende des Nibelungen*, pp. 84, 85.

⁵ E. Mogk, *Die germanische Heldendichtung*, 1895, and J. Göbel, "On the Original Form of the Legend of Sigfrid," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XII (1897), pp. 461-74.

tragedy, and passion. But when we endeavor to analyze her accurately, to determine just what she is and just what she does, we encounter almost insuperable obstacles. For the *Poetic Edda* does not give us a single, consistent story, but detached, often fragmentary lays, treating different aspects or different forms of the legend. And when we try to discover exactly what is presented we inevitably become entangled in theories of the origin and development of the story. There are two main points concerning Brynhild on which scholars differ. The first is that of her identity. Is she, in these lays, a divine valkyrie, or the daughter of a mortal king? Are Brynhild and Sigdrifa one and the same person here and in their origin, or two different persons, later combined into one? The second point, her relations with Sigurd, depends largely on the first. The dispute here centers especially on the question whether Sigurd originally met Brynhild and became betrothed to her before obtaining her for Gunnar, or whether his visit to her in Gunnar's form was his first meeting with her.

The arguments of the specialists on these questions are numerous and intricate. For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to consider them at any length; but without at least a glimpse of the theories of the original form and the development of the legend it is hardly possible to discuss intelligently the contents of the lays, for the interpretation of the poems depends largely on the theory adopted.

Perhaps the most prominent and the clearest account of the growth of the story is that of the distinguished German scholar Mogk.¹ He believes that in the original Frankish saga the heroes were human beings, though idealized. Brynhild was no divine valkyrie, but a warrior maiden, who would marry only a man of superior power and strength. Sigurd came and betrothed himself to her. Then he married someone else and gave Brynhild to his brother-in-law, subduing her for her husband after their marriage. When she learned of this she caused his death and died with him. The story contained no supernatural or mythical elements. This

¹*Die germanische Heldendichtung, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Sage von Siegfried u. Brunhild*, 1895.

developed among the Germans into the *Nibelungenlied* version. It also passed to the Norse poets, who added the purely Norse valkyrie motive and the magic sleep. There are still, thinks Mogk, two parallel sagas recognizable, in which the relations between Sigurd and Brynhild are differently conceived. In one, Sigurd wakes a divine valkyrie sleeping behind the wall of flame. In the other, he comes in youth to a bold princess, a maiden delighting in war, and is betrothed to her. In general, then, Mogk thinks that Brynhild resulted from a combination of two different figures—the valkyrie and the Amazonian princess—and that the early meeting and betrothal with Sigurd, previous to his obtaining her for Gunnar, was an original element in the legend.

Other scholars advance varying theories. Lichtenberger,¹ for example, agrees with Mogk in believing that Brynhild resulted from a union of two distinct legends, which he considers to have been that of the valkyrie Sigdrifa—the “sleeping beauty” motive—and that of a mortal warrior maiden, won by trickery for another. He differs from Mogk in holding that the idea of Brynhild’s early betrothal to Sigurd, previous to his obtaining her for Gunnar, was a late addition to the story. Another scholar, Sijmons,² agrees with this latter assertion, but differs from the other two in believing that the sleeping valkyrie Sigdrifa and the daughter of the mortal king Budli were one and the same person. He argues, that is, for the original and essential unity of the figure of Brynhild. Finally, anyone with a taste for complexity may prefer to hold with a fourth scholar, Boer,³ that the warrior maiden Brynhild and the valkyrie Sigdrifa originally developed from the same idea—the “sleeping beauty” motive; but that at the time of the Eddic lays they were conceived of as different persons; and that they were later united again into one figure. Many other scholars besides these have, of course, entered into the controversy, and the several theories have been developed with much elaboration and variation of details.

With some notion of these problems in mind, it is possible to summarize more intelligently the actual contents of the lays deal-

¹ *Le poème et la légende des Nibelungen*, Paris, 1891.

² *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Vol. XXIV (1892), pp. 1-32.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXV (1903), pp. 289 ff.

ing with Brynhild, as far, that is, as their meaning can be definitely ascertained.

The most important is the long and striking Brynhild lay inappropriately known as the *Short Lay of Sigurd*. In it the interest of the poet centers on the thoughts and acts of Brynhild *after* her marriage with Gunnar, psychologically the most interesting part of the story. In the opening strophes, however, and in Brynhild's narrative just before her death, we get some account of the events preceding this marriage, and thus obtain a fairly complete view of the poet's conception of the whole course of the story. Brynhild is *not* mentioned as a valkyrie, nor is there any reference to her magic sleep or the surrounding fire. She is a mortal "shield-maiden," fond of war and averse to wedlock, the daughter of King Budli and the sister of Atli—who is, by the way, the great and terrible Attila, strangely wandering in mediaeval legend. The Giukings (Gunnar and his brethren) come to Atli's seeking her hand. Atli, by a threat of withholding from her her wealth, forces her to say that she will marry. She thinks of taking up arms in defense of her liberty, but decides to submit. Then she evidently plights her troth to Sigurd, who appears in Gunnar's form, and whom she has apparently never seen before, but whom she now loves with her great and only love. There is no mention of the feat to be performed to win her. But the narrative is extremely hazy and elliptical at this point. It is clear, however, that she and Sigurd are not united in wedlock, but that the Volsung keeps faith with Gunnar.¹ Brynhild never loves her husband. How she discovers the deception practiced upon her is not told; but she evidently does, for she refers to Gunnar's having beguiled her. She is apparently driven to desire Sigurd's death chiefly by jealousy—by the thought of Gudrun in his arms. She urges Gunnar to kill him, threatening otherwise to go back to her kin; but she alleges no wrong done her by Sigurd, advancing as a reason only that Gunnar may make his power greater than the Volsung's. Gunnar is unwilling to break faith with Sigurd, but rather than lose Brynhild and her treasure he finally consents. His brother Guttorm is induced to slay Sigurd as he lies in his

¹ See Magnusson and Morris' translation in *The Story of the Volsungs*, pp. 177 and 196.

bed. Before he dies the hero declares that Brynhild has caused his death, that she loved him, but that he has never been false to Gunnar. There is no suggestion of Sigurd's loving Brynhild. When she hears the wail of Gudrun over the body of her dead lord, Brynhild laughs once, but pales and looks strange. In answer to Gunnar's reproaches she relates the story of her life, professing her love for Sigurd and complaining of having been beguiled. Gunnar, who appears to love her passionately, tries to dissuade her from suicide, but in vain. Donning her gold byrny, she stabs herself with her sword. Then she prophesies to Gunnar. Finally, begging that she may be burned with Sigurd on his funeral pyre, and thus follow him to the other world, she dies.

The Fragments of the Lay of Brynhild deal chiefly with Sigurd's death, giving a rather different version of the tale, whereby Sigurd is slain out of doors, as in Wagner's music drama. The poem is so fragmentary and confused that it is difficult to get any definite story from it. In the parts remaining to us there is no mention of the valkyrie nature of Brynhild nor of the fire ride. She is referred to as Budli's daughter. Only one meeting between her and Sigurd is mentioned—apparently the occasion when he wooed her for Gunnar. The fragments open abruptly with a conversation between Gunnar and his brother Hogni, wherein the former urges as a reason for killing Sigurd that the Volsung has broken faith with him—apparently when wooing Brynhild for him. Hogni hints that Brynhild is urging the murder through jealousy of Gudrun. In the next fragment Sigurd is slain by Guttorm on the banks of the Rhine, and the news brought by Hogni to the queens. Brynhild declares that they did well to kill him, for they will now have great power which would have been his had he lived. Then she laughs once. Afterward she puzzles the people by lamenting the deed she had desired. She prophesies woe to the Niblungs for breaking their oaths with Sigurd; and asserts that when he wooed her for Gunnar he kept his vow, laying his sword between them. Then the lay breaks off. As nearly as one can judge from the fragments, they present about the same version of the Brynhild story as does the *Short Lay of Sigurd*, with the important exception that Gunnar

accuses Sigurd, though wrongly, of having broken faith in the wooing.

The lays we are to consider next give a rather different picture of the heroine. In the *Lay of Fafnir*, after Sigurd has slain the dragon and Regin, the birds sing to him of his future. First they tell him of Giuki's daughter, whom he can obtain with his gold. Then they describe to him¹ the hall on Hindfell surrounded by flames, where sleeps a warrior maiden, a valkyrie, plunged in slumber by Odin as a punishment for choosing in war the one he willed not. "You will see, O Hero, the helmed maid who rode from battle on Vinskornir. By the decree of the Norns Sigdrifa cannot break the bonds of sleep."² According to some scholars "Sigdrifa" is here merely an epithet applied to Brynhild, "the dispenser of victory,"³ but others hold that it is the name of a person quite distinct from Budli's daughter. We may say, at all events, that the lay presents to us a valkyrie, whoever she may be, sleeping and surrounded by fire, because of disobedience of Odin. From the order in which the events are mentioned, it seems to indicate also, though this is disputed, that Sigurd went to Giuki's and was betrothed to Gudrun *before* he awakened the valkyrie sleeping on the mountain.

The very important *Lay of Sigdrifa* is one of the centers of controversy, and is translated in various ways. According to the verses which have survived, it seems that a hero, presumably Sigurd,⁴ awakens a sleeping maiden, cutting away her armor. In phrases of dignity and beauty she greets the world—the light of day, the gods. Then she gives Sigurd much sage advice on life in general. These "runes" seem to be generally admitted to be a later interpolation, due to the Norse passion for didactic poetry.⁵ According to the accompanying prose explanations, of later date, she calls herself Sigdrifa and is a valkyrie, condemned by Odin, because of her disobedience in causing the death of Hjalmgunnar, to act as valkyrie no more, but to sleep and to wed. She herself vowed to wed no one who felt fear. It seems evident that the

¹ Magnusson and Morris' translation, pp. 65, 66; Gering, pp. 210, 211.

² Translations of this passage differ widely.

⁴ But see Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

³ See Gering's translation.

⁵ Gering, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

compiler of the lays, who added the prose, understood Sigrdrifa to be a different person from Brynhild. As to whether she originally was or not, there is, as we have said, a profound difference of opinion among the scholars. They differ also as to whether the lay indicates that she and Sigurd plighted troth together, or merely that she bestowed wisdom on him.

The very striking lay called the *Hell-Ride of Brynhild* is also a favorite battle-ground of the critics. After her death and Sigurd's and their burning on the funeral pyre, "Brynhild drave in her chariot down along the way to Hell, and passed by an abode where dwelt a certain giantess, and the giantess spake,"¹ and reproached her with following the husband of another, and with having caused the death of men. Brynhild, to justify herself, relates the story of her life and wrongs. According to this version, she is the daughter of Budli, a maiden fond of war. But she is also a valkyrie, who disobeyed Odin by giving victory in battle to Aud's brother, instead of to the old Hjalmgunnar. At this point occurs a strophe (No. 6) which is given very different meanings in the different translations. According to one widely accepted version, it explains Brynhild's reason for giving victory to Aud's brother, Agnarr.² She, as valkyrie, had also the characteristics of a swan maiden, and when Agnarr stole her swan dress, which she had laid aside under an oak-tree, she was in his power, and was forced to promise him victory in battle. Other scholars consider that the lines say nothing at all about Agnarr or swan garments, interpreting them variously as referring to her life with Heimi, her early betrothal to Sigurd, Odin's placing her under her shield in slumber, or otherwise. It is apparently impossible to decide whether or no Brynhild was forced to aid Agnarr by this ruse of the usual swan-maiden story. It seems probable, however, that she did not, as is sometimes asserted, betroth herself to him.³

Whatever the cause of her disobedience, in punishment there for, as the lay goes on to tell us, Odin shut her within a shield wall, surrounded by fire, and decreed that he alone should break her slumber who knew no fear and who brought the gold guarded

¹ Magnusson and Morris, p. 197.

² Gering, p. 239.

³ Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

by Fafnir. There now seems to be a strange jump or gap in the narrative. The hero's breaking through the fire and awakening her is not mentioned, but the scene shifts abruptly from the realm of gods and magic fire to the house of Heimi, Brynhild's foster-father. "Then upon Grani rode the goodly gold-strewer to where my fosterer ruled his fair dwelling."¹ This seems, from what follows, to refer to Sigurd's arrival in Gunnar's form. They are betrothed, but *not* united in wedlock. Later Gudrun reproaches her with having "slept in the arms of Sigurd;" and then Brynhild knows that they have tricked her in the betrothal, and have given to her "a loveless life, a life of lies." She seems to feel that Sigurd was her destined mate and that in dying together they are united for eternity.

This puzzling lay therefore shows Brynhild both as a valkyrie surrounded by fire and as a human princess under Heimi's fostering care. The man who wins her must ride the fire, but his riding of it is not narrated. Only one meeting with Sigurd is told of²—when he wins her for Gunnar at Heimi's and keeps faith with his brother. It is Gudrun who reveals the deception. We can venture, I think, to suggest that this lay shows an imperfect blending of the two forms—the disobedient valkyrie to be awakened by the hero who passes the fire, and the mortal princess won by trickery for another. The gap where the two are joined seems apparent. But it is, of course, always possible that some strophes have dropped out.

We come now to a lay which, though not admirable as a literary production, is very interesting in the development of the legend—the *Lay of Gripir*.³ Sigurd is here supposed to visit his uncle Gripir, who foretells to him all the events of his life, in that distressingly undramatic fashion of which the prophecy-loving Norse poets seem very fond. According to Gripir's narrative, frequently interrupted by Sigurd's questions and comments, the hero awakes, by slitting her hauberk with his sword, a king's daughter asleep on a mountain, surrounded by flames. She teaches him wisdom.

¹ Magnusson and Morris, p. 200.

² Unless we interpret Strophe 6 as alluding to an early betrothal with Sigurd. See above, p. 8, and Boer, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

³ *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, pp. 285 ff.

Sigurd then goes to Heimi's and there falls in love with that lord's foster-daughter, Brynhild, the daughter of Budli. They plight troth. He next visits Giuki's, where by the old queen Grimhild's magic craft he is made to forget Brynhild. When offered Gudrun for his wife, Sigurd assumes Gunnar's form and obtains for him Brynhild, keeping faith with his brother in wooing her. Afterward the Volsung remembers the past, but he can do nothing to remedy matters, and "he does not begrudge Gudrun her luck"—an interesting touch. In revenge for the wrong done her, Brynhild persuades Gunnar that Sigurd broke faith with him in the wooing, and Giuki's sons slay the hero. It is interesting to note that Sigurd, on hearing this prophecy, expresses the deepest horror at his base treachery to Brynhild; but his uncle endeavors to cheer him by the assurance that it will be all Grimhild's fault; Sigurd himself will not be to blame.

In this plot, of which the lay gives only a rather bare outline, several things are striking: the sleeping fire-girt maiden, who merely gives Sigurd wisdom, is distinguished from Budli's daughter Brynhild, the foster-child of Heimi; Sigurd and Brynhild meet, love, and plight troth before he goes to Giuki's; he is made by magic to forget her before he wins her for Gunnar. Save for the distinction between Brynhild and the sleeping maiden, in this lay the story closely approximates its final form.

Besides occasional references, we find in the Eddic lays one other version of the Brynhild legend, given incidentally in the *Lament of Oddrun*.¹ Brynhild is referred to as a valkyrie and as a king's daughter fond of war. She sits in her bower embroidering when Sigurd first approaches her hall. Then there is an attack on her castle and she is won. Not long afterward she learns of the "wiles" and takes dreadful vengeance. Finally she kills herself because of the death of Sigurd. These hazy references seem to point to a version somewhat different from those of the other lays. The embroidery scene suggests the setting of Sigurd's second meeting with Brynhild as it is found in the *Völsunga Saga*.

Without pretending to side with any one theory of the inter-

¹ Magnusson and Morris, p. 258.

pretation of these lays, it seems possible to state a few general conclusions about the questions in dispute. As for Brynhild's identity, whatever this may have been in the original and essential kernel of the story, it seems that several different elements—we will not say different personalities or individuals—ultimately combined in her figure. There was the mortal maiden fond of war, as she appears in chronicles of old Germanic times, when, among a war-loving people, even maidens sometimes donned helmet and hauberk and tasted of the joys of battle.¹ There appears also the idea of her fierce aversion to wedlock. At some time there certainly entered in the Norse conception of the valkyrie: the maiden riding through the air and hovering over the battlefields, possessed of supernatural powers of prophecy and allotment of fate in war; sometimes in the service of Odin, carrying out his will in battle and bearing the dead heroes to Valhalla. And possibly there were introduced also the "swan maiden" characteristics which every valkyrie was supposed to have, for a valkyrie was a swan maiden and something more.² The Norse mind does not seem to have objected to combining in the same person a mortal king's daughter and a valkyrie. Sigrun also, in the *Helgi Lays*, is both.

As for Brynhild's relations with Sigurd, it is certain that at some time the hero did wake a sleeping, fire-girt maiden, whoever she may originally have been—i.e., we find the "sleeping beauty" motive. And he did win by deceit for another a king's daughter. Whether original or not in the tale, there entered in at some time the idea of his previous betrothal to this maiden. But there is nothing in the existing lays to indicate that she and Sigurd were ever united in wedlock. And the strongest emphasis is laid, again and again, on the fact that he kept faith with his brother in the wooing. Finally, it is clear that in revenge and jealousy Brynhild caused Sigurd's death. The problem as to the precise order in which these various elements were combined, and the

¹ E. Mogk, on "Mythology," in Paul's *Grundriss*, Vol. I, p. 1014.

² On valkyries and swan maidens, see E. Mogk in Paul's *Grundriss*, Vol. I, pp. 1014 ff., 1023 ff., 1026, 1027; and a somewhat different account in Simrock, *Deutsche Mythologie*, pp. 359 ff.

precise time when the combinations took place, seems insoluble and on the whole unimportant.

It is more interesting to banish from our minds these theories and analyses and to consider the literary effect in the *Edda* of the figure of Brynhild, or of Brynhild *plus* Sigdrifa. In the lays which have survived Brynhild does not appear as a valkyrie in action, but in the *Helgi Lays*¹ we find what was a Norse poet's conception of this splendid product of the northern imagination. Since this seems to have influenced later portrayals of Brynhild, it is worth citing here. The valkyrie Sigrun, also a king's daughter and faithful to her love even beyond the grave, is portrayed as hovering in the air over her betrothed, saving him from the storm on the sea and protecting him in battle on land. The description of her first appearance to him gives the keynote which Wagner elaborated in his valkyries. After Helgi has fought a battle—

Then over Lowefell there burst flashes of light, and out of the flashes the lightnings leapt. . . . Then appeared high in air a troop of maidens, riding in the field of Heaven; they wore helmets, and their mail coats were flecked with blood, and from their spear-points light-beams shone. It was early when the king called out of Wolfwood to the maids of the South, and asked them if they would follow him home that night—there was a clang of bowstrings. But Hogni's daughter answered from where she sat on her steed—the shield-clash lulled.²

When Brynhild first appears to us she has lost her valkyrie-ship; but we are compensated by the finely imaginative and romantic picture of the maiden sunk in sleep, girt about by the flames which the fearless hero alone can pass. And there is poetry and dignity in her awakening greeting, closely followed by Wagner:

Hail to the day come back!
Hail, sons of the daylight!³

But the chief interest centers in the events following her marriage with Gunnar, especially in the stormy conflict of passions within her breast. There is a marked psychological study. She appears as a character capable of one great, all-mastering

¹ *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, pp. 129 ff.

² *Corp. Poet. Bor.*, Vol. I, p. 133.

³ Magnússon and Morris, p. 69.

love, and as the type of a woman bitterly wronged, driven on to the catastrophe by love, jealousy, and desire for revenge. Her agony of jealousy is made especially striking by the survival of the fine passage in the *Short Lay of Sigurd*:

Oft with heart deep
In dreadful thoughts,
O'er ice-fields and ice-hills
She fared a-night time,
When he and Gudrun
Were gone to their fair bed,

"Ah! now the Hun King
His queen in arms holdeth,
While love I go lacking,
And all things longed for,
With no delight
But in dreadful thought."

These dreadful things
Thrust her toward murder.¹

Driven on by jealousy and her sense of wrong, she obtains a bloody revenge. She even insists on the death of Sigurd's young son. And when Sigurd is slain and Gudrun laments her dead lord, she feels in her triumph a strange and terrible joy.

Then laughed Brynhild,
Budli's daughter,
Once, once only,
From out her heart;
When to her bed
Was borne the sound
Of the sore greeting
Of Giuki's daughter.²

Sigurd she loved with a passionate and immutable love, deeming them fated to each other.

For myself had I given
To that great king
Who sat amid gold
On the back of Grani . . .
One I loved,
One, and none other.³

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179.

² *Ibid.*, p. 185.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 188.

But he was cut off from her in this life by his marriage to another. She proudly protests,

Far be it from me,
Feeble and wavering,
Ever to love
Another's love—.¹

The one solution is death, the one escape from the "loveless life, the life of lies," wrought for her by the sons of Giuki—death for Sigurd in expiation of the wrong done her, death for herself that she may follow him to the other world and be united with him forever. She feels pride in her faithfulness to her love, and disparages Gudrun in comparison:

More seemly for Gudrun
Your very sister,
In death to wend after
Her love first wed;
Had but good rede
To her been given,
Or if her heart
Had been like to my heart.²

The narrative of her end, as she follows her love in death, is pitched in a key of lofty and tragic dignity: her request that she and Sigurd may be burned together on the funeral pyre, with his sword between them; her proud justification of her acts to the "giant woman" as she drives in her chariot down along the way to Hell.

Of a softer side of her nature we see nothing. To the other characters, and to the poet himself—or poets—she seemed, one feels, a terrible and mysterious person, ill-fated, almost supernatural. She appears so even to Gunnar, who loves her passionately. When she laughs at Sigurd's death, he cries:

Whereas thou laughest,
O hateful woman,
Glad on thy bed,
No good it betokeneth:
Why lackest thou else

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 188.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 194.

Thy lovely hue?
Feeder of foul deeds,
Fey do I deem thee.¹

The people wonder at her, when she laments after Sigurd's death.

All kept silence
After her speaking,
None might know
That woman's mind,
Or why she must weep
To tell of the work
That laughing once
Of men she prayed.²

The poet portrays her in wild and terrible fashion:

By a pillar she stood
And strained its wood to her;
From the eyes of Brynhild,
Budli's daughter,
Flashed out fire,
And she snorted forth venom,
As the sore wounds she gazed on
Of the dead-slain Sigurd.³

Gudrun and her waiting women curse her as the cause of so many woes.⁴ The giant woman reproaches her with having brought about the death of men.⁵ Hogni, when begged by Gunnar to prevent her suicide, protests,

Nay, let hard need
Have rule thereover,
And no man let her
Of her long journey!
Never born again,
May she come back thence!

Luckless she came
To the lap of her mother,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

² *Ibid.*, p. 206.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

Born into the world
 For utter woe,
 To many a man
 For heart-whole mourning.¹

The loneliness of her position accentuates the tragic effect. She stands utterly alone, understood and sympathized with by no one, with affection only from the husband whom she can never love, and who is himself one of the chief causes of her woe.

Gloom enwraps her figure, and the feeling of the terrible power of Fate, in which mankind is helpless. Even Brynhild seems to believe that the men who have wronged her are not altogether to blame; all are swept on together by the irresistible might of a cruel Fate. She laments

The dread Norns wrought for us
 A long while of woe.²

She prophesies of Oddrun to Gunnar,

And she shall love thee
 As I had loved thee,
 If in such wise
 Fate had willed it.³

Death, Brynhild seems to feel, is man's one avenue of escape from the cruelties of Fate. And in her last words to the giant woman there is a note of triumph:

Ah! for unrest
 All too long
 Are men and women
 Made alive!
 Yet we twain together
 Shall wear through the ages,
 Sigurd and I.—
 Sink a-down, O giant-wife.⁴

Such is the figure of Brynhild as she appears in the surviving lays of the *Elder Edda*. But the complete Norse conception of her can be obtained only when we add to these poems a study of the *Völsunga Saga*. This prose version of the tale was "composed probably some time in the twelfth century, from floating

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 189.

² *Ibid.*, p. 178.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

traditions, no doubt; from songs which, now lost, were then known, at least in fragments, to the Sagaman; and finally from the songs which, written down about his time, are still existing."¹ In the chapters of the Saga covered by the poems which have survived, we can see that the author of the prose was paraphrasing his originals closely. We can reasonably assume that his other chapters were, for the most part, based closely on lays no longer in existence. And we must bitterly regret this loss, for, fine as the prose is, it lacks some of the splendor and intensity of the Eddic poetry. The episodes which we obtain only from the Saga comprise the most dramatic portion of the tale: Sigurd's visit to Hlymdale, Heimi's home, and his second meeting with Brynhild there; Gudrun's prophetic dream and her visit to Brynhild to hear its interpretation; Sigurd's arrival at Giuki's hall and the magic potion given him by Grimhild, the old queen, to make him forget his first love; his wedding with Gudrun; his second riding of the flames, in Gunnar's form, to win the maiden for his brother; Brynhild's marriage with Gunnar; Sigurd's returning memory of the past, but inability to alter the situation; the quarrel between the queens, when Gudrun reveals to Brynhild the deception practiced on her; the agony and wrath of Brynhild and the great scene between her and Sigurd. All these, though there are allusions to many of them in the lays, are found in full only in the Saga.

For all this we owe the Sagaman an immense debt of gratitude; but we can scarcely credit him with a unifying imagination or constructive art. He seems to have merely patched the lays together, without much effort to make the story unified and consistent. He even left in manifest contradictions. Brynhild's account to Gunnar,² for example, of the events connected with her marriage is inconsistent with the story as given in the preceding chapters.

As for the mooted point of Brynhild's identity, though the Sagaman identifies the disobedient valkyrie, sleeping on the mountain and awakened by Sigurd, with Brynhild, Budli's daughter, the "shield-maiden" fond of war, he does not make

¹ *Ibid.*, p. xi.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 102, 103.

of her a clear or consistent figure. According to his account Sigurd and Brynhild plight troth on the mountain Hindfell, after she is awakened and gives him wisdom. Then she goes to Hlymdale, to her foster-father, Heimi, and sits in her bower among her maidens. Here, in curious contrast to her acknowledged fierce fondness for life on the battlefield, she displays quite a feminine domesticity. "She could more skill in handy-craft than other women," and "sat overlaying cloth with gold and sewing thereon the great deeds which Sigurd had wrought—the slaying of the Worm, and the taking of the wealth of him, and the death of Regin withal."¹ To Hlymdale comes Sigurd on a visit, and chancing to pursue his hawk up a high tower he there sees a fair woman, and he knows that it is Brynhild, and "he deems all things he sees there to be worthy together, both her fairness and the fair things she wrought." Now apparently deeply in love with her, he discusses her with Heimi's son, Alswid, who tells of her averseness to the other sex and her fondness for war—but says nothing of her career as a valkyrie, nor of the magic, flame-encircled sleep from which she has presumably just returned. In fact, the valkyrie idea seems to be dropped from Brynhild after her first appearance. In a striking scene she and Sigurd swear to each other love and fidelity, and he gives her a ring—a sort of second betrothal. Brynhild seems throughout the tale to be a person of unsettled residence. Some time after Sigurd's departure, she apparently leaves Hlymdale and re-establishes herself in a flame-encircled hall. And now the fire ride appears as the test which she has imposed on the man who would win her. Gunnar—or rather Sigurd, whom she believes to be Gunnar—appears and demands that she fulfil her pledge to wed him who should ride the flames. One would think that her betrothal to Sigurd, the first rider of the fire, would have absolved her from further obligations of this sort; but she admits Gunnar's claim and yields herself to him. On his departure she returns to Heimi's, and goes thence to Budli's, that her father may bestow her in marriage on Gunnar in conventionally proper style. It is evident that we have in all this a rather careless

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 82.

mingling of lays originally composed by various poets, who were dealing with different episodes, versions, and aspects of a great body of tradition.

One striking point in the Saga, seriously affecting the plot, is the introduction of Aslaug, the daughter of Sigurd and Brynhild. This idea seems to be a late invention, inserted for genealogical reasons, perhaps by the compiler of the Saga, who wished to connect the Volsungs with his Aslaug story.¹ There appears to be no other indication that Sigurd and Brynhild were united in wedlock; that the relation between them was more than a betrothal.

But any analysis of the inconsistencies of the plot is a rather thankless task. Read in the proper spirit, the Saga is, after all, very pleasing as it is. On some striking characteristics of Brynhild it throws new light. She is impressive and interesting in the scene with Sigurd in Gunnar's guise, when he has ridden through the flames to her hall and claimed her. "Call thou to mind thine oath," he says, "concerning the riding through of the fire, wherein thou didst swear that thou wouldst go with the man who should do this deed."² Brynhild is heavy at heart, having deemed that the feat could be performed only by Sigurd, her "first troth-plight and well-beloved;" but she will not be forsworn. True to her oath, she yields herself to him whom she supposes to be Gunnar, and gives him the ring "Andvari's loom," bestowed on her by Sigurd. Brynhild's strong desire to be faithful to her oath, thus accentuated here, is recurred to later in the story, when she finds that through the trick practiced upon her she has been forced to break her vow and live forsworn.

The great scenes preceding the catastrophe are dramatic in the extreme: the quarrel between the queens, when Gudrun reveals the trick and displays the ring "Andvari's loom," given her by Sigurd; Brynhild's unrestrained grief; her reproaches to Gunnar and fierce desire to slay him; her jealousy and wrath; above all, the much-praised scene with Sigurd. The Volsung is torn in soul by her anguish, her reproaches, and her determination to die.

¹ See *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Vol. I, p. 394, note.

² Magnusson and Morris, p. 96.

He excuses himself by the drink of forgetfulness; he offers her all his gold if she will but live; protesting his love for her, he rejoices that they may at least live as friends beneath the same roof; he suggests that they may live as lovers; he offers even to put away Gudrun and wed Brynhild, that she may keep her vow. But if the man is willing to compromise with Fate, not so the woman. Clearly does she seem to see that a shameful wrong cannot be righted by another wrong. "I will not have two kings in one hall," she declares, "I will lay down my life rather than beguile Gunnar the king." Nor will she consent that wrong be done her rival Gudrun. For the sorrow and dishonor in which Fate has entangled them, death is the only remedy. And when Sigurd leaves her he knows, we feel, that the end is near at hand.

There has been considerable discussion of the motives which drove Brynhild to cause Sigurd's death. It has been suggested that, being endowed with divine, prophetic power, she knew beforehand that he was not to be responsible for his acts, and would not have punished him for deeds over which he had really no control. In fact, she admits knowledge of the drink of forgetfulness. Miss Weston, in her *Legends of the Wagner Drama*,¹ following this line of thought, seems to think she had him killed solely because he told Gudrun of the trick. This appears to be a rather quibbling way of regarding the situation. Divine valkyrie though Brynhild was, we should not, I think, take her prophetic power very seriously. Nearly everybody in the Eddic poetry seems to prophesy sooner or later, but this supposed knowledge of the future does not affect any one's actions. It is apparently a mere literary convention, designed to gratify a strange and unhappy taste. Moreover, the drink of forgetfulness would excuse only Sigurd's faithlessness to his first love and marriage with Gudrun. It would not entirely excuse the deceit he practiced when he won Brynhild for Gunnar. And it is the discovery of this trick which apparently enflames her with a desire for vengeance. The Norse poets, however, would probably not analyze the situation so subtly as modern critics. Nor would revenge by murder seem to them the terrible and unusual thing it is to us.

¹ Pp. 128 and 151.

They probably conceived Brynhild as being very naturally driven on, not by one definite motive, but, as men and women generally are, by a mingling of motives—revenge, jealousy, agony that Sigurd should have given her rival the chance to mock at her, unwillingness to live forsworn a loveless and dishonored life, and, as I have several times suggested, a feeling that, guiltless though Sigurd may be, from the dishonor in which Fate has involved them, death is the only escape. By death alone can they expiate their sins, unwitting though they may have been; by death alone can their love be made again pure and perfect.

"I will not live," says Brynhild to Gunnar, "for Sigurd has bewrayed me, yea and thee no less, whereas thou didst suffer him to come into my bed: lo thou, two men in one dwelling I will not have; and this shall be Sigurd's death, or thy death, or my death; for now has he told Gudrun all, and she is mocking me even now."

With this last very human touch the great chapter closes. In the account of the deaths of the two lovers, the Saga follows the surviving lays.

The atmosphere of gloom which enwraps this old Norse literature, the setting of storms and ice-fields, is in striking contrast to the typical landscape of the mediaeval French romances—the green meadow, fair in the sunshine, the bright flowers, the bubbling spring, the birds singing sweetly in the overhanging branches. Fully as radical is the contrast between the gracious heroine of romance and the tragic, terrible figure of Brynhild, with her fierce passion, her loyalty to her oath, her "northern pride of purity," her determination to love with honor or to die.

Any study of the origin of the Volsung or Niblung legend would, of course, necessitate a careful consideration of the *Thidreksaga*, for this is supposed to throw much light on the early German form of the story. But in the literary development of the character of Brynhild the *Thidreksaga* seems unimportant, and it may be omitted here. The later German version of the tale, however, the *Nibelungenlied*, written about 1200, is too important a literary monument to be passed over.

This hybrid composition, strange mingling of epic plot and

romance setting, is in nothing more unfortunate than in its portrayal of Brünhilt. In interest and in dignity she falls far below the Norse character. The poet does not seem to have been attracted by her—small wonder, considering the material he had—and he treats her with little sympathy. His interest centers on other points in the tale.

As she appears in the *Nibelungenlied*, she is no divine valkyrie, nor is she exactly a mortal "shield-maiden." She is queen of "Issland," dwelling at her castle of "Isenstein," "passing fair" but a lady of decidedly Amazonian tendencies, showing traces of supernatural characteristics by the possession of the strength of a dozen men. She will wed only the man who can surpass her in throwing the spear, hurling the stone, and leaping—rather prosaic equivalents for the fire ride. And if the candidate fails in but one, he loses his head.

Her relations with Siegfried are somewhat puzzling. So far as the poem tells us, she never loves him, nor he her. The poet, we feel, knew of no love between them. But there are some indications that in an earlier version the two did meet and love before Siegfried won her for Gunther:¹ the fact, for example, that Siegfried is familiar with the route to her court and the customs there, and knows her by sight; and her tears when she sees him sitting by Kriemhilt's side. But save for these vague relics, the love between the two has quite dropped out of the poem as it stands. It is scarcely necessary to point out the immense change in the plot and the loss of dramatic interest which this produces. The illustrious pair, united for eternity in the Norse saga, are here never united at all.

Siegfried's successful trickery in winning her for Gunther evidently gratified the poet extremely, and he narrates it with unction, never suggesting that it was at all dishonorable. Journeying to Isenstein as Gunther's pretended vassal, Siegfried aids his prospective brother-in-law to win the Amazonian maid. Rendered invisible by the "tarn kappe" he makes it appear that Gunther has won in the contests, and Brünhilt is forced to wed the Burgundian

¹ E. Mogk, *op. cit.*, asserts that they have met and loved. See a full discussion of the evidence in the poem in Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 158 ff.

king. This does not seem to improve her disposition. When Gunther refuses to tell her at once why he gave his sister in marriage to Siegfried, whom Brünhilt believes to be his vassal, she declines to abide by her word and refuses to live in wedlock with her husband. One can hear the old-time audience chuckling at the rude humor of her hanging Gunther on the nail to suffer through an uncomfortable night, and rejoicing when this unfeminine rebellion is brutally punished in the unpleasant episode where Siegfried, again assuming the tarn kappe, subdues her for her husband. The whole proceeding certainly reflects no credit on any of the characters concerned.

In striking contrast to the course of events in the Norse legend, in the *Nibelungenlied* Brünhilt is *not* the instigator of Siegfried's murder. It is interesting to note the "feudalization" of the story, especially at this point, the substitution of feudal motives for the passions which govern the Norse characters. Siegfried has indiscreetly boasted to his wife of his conquest of Brünhilt for Gunther. Consequently, when, after many years, Brünhilt taunts Kriemhilt with having wedded her brother's vassal, the latter retorts by accusing Brünhilt of having had Siegfried as a lover. Thus learning of the trick played upon her, and incensed that Siegfried should have boasted of it, Brünhilt loudly laments in wounded pride. Gunther is contented with having Siegfried swear that he never declared he had been Brünhilt's lover. But Hagen, the faithful vassal, learning of Siegfried's supposed boast, loyally determines to revenge the insult offered to his liege lady. Hagen it is, then, who finally persuades Gunther to assent to the plan and bring about Siegfried's death.

Under these circumstances there is, of course, no reason for Brünhilt's following the Volsung into the other world. She comes to no tragic end, but lives on. From the moment when Hagen determines on Siegfried's death, save for a few unimportant allusions she fades from the story.

In her figure as it appears here there is none of the dignity, the nobility, the lofty pride of the Norse Brynhild. She is not torn by the great, elemental passions which make Budli's daughter a real and moving figure for all time. Small wonder that later

poets have neglected the *Nibelungenlied*, and turned for inspiration to the northern legend.

In the great nineteenth-century versions of the Volsung legend, both following more or less closely the Norse form, Brynhild comes into her own. Psychologically perhaps the most interesting person in the story, and winning sympathy through her wrongs and undeserved suffering, she is to the modern mind an attractive and moving figure. Of Wagner's and Morris' great poems, Morris' *Sigurd the Volsung* adheres more closely to the Norse version and may best be considered first.

For the most part Morris follows reverently the course of events narrated in the *Völsunga Saga*, elaborating them in description, character-drawing, and accessory incidents. He has, however, tried to simplify and unify Brynhild's figure. He has cut out her relationship with Budli and Atli and the complications which that involves. She remains a mortal princess, sister-in-law of Heimir, chosen by Odin as a valkyrie, and plunged in sleep in punishment for her disobedience in choosing the victors in battle. Here, too, the magic fire surrounds her to keep away all save the destined fearless hero. But there still remains in the story much of the puzzling obscurity about her various residences, her return to the fire, and the nature of her oath as to the fire ride, which we noted in the *Völsunga Saga*. Here, too, after the opening scene, her valkyrie nature seems to vanish. She is not a supernatural person; she has, happily, lost her prophetic power; she is merely a wise woman, and, above all, a great queen.

The general softening of her character in accordance with nineteenth-century ideals is especially noticeable. She is no longer a grim and terrible figure. Next after the "golden Sigurd" himself she seems the favorite of the author. He represents her always as very beautiful—"exceeding glorious,"¹ "the fairest of all things fashioned."² Her manners are always the perfection of dignified courtesy. In the two love scenes with Sigurd she is tender, loving, and womanly. Her passions are not fierce, revengeful, and unrestrained: she does not try to kill Gunnar in her agony; she does not cause the death of Sigurd's young son; as

¹ *Sigurd the Volsung*, p. 216.

² *Ibid.*, p. 227.

the plot is here handled she does not have to insist urgently on Sigurd's death, for Gunnar needs no more than a suggestion.

The idea of her fidelity to her oath, found in the *Saga*, Morris has admirably thrown into relief. Sigurd in Gunnar's form tells her truly, when he demands her hand, "Thou art none of the women that swear and forswear and rejoice."¹ She crushes her sorrow and love for the lost Sigurd, and weds as she believes duty and honor demand. Giving to the "image of Gunnar" Sigurd's gift, "Andvari's ring," she says,

"Lo, here, my gift of the morning! twas my dearest treasure of all,
But thou art become its master, for thee was it foreordained,
Since thou art the man of mine oath and the best that the earth has
gained."²

But most striking of Brynhild's traits is her dignified and wise self-restraint. She controls her sorrows and her passions, and moves through life with outward calm, performing her duties as a great queen should. This impression Morris has succeeded in developing very happily. It is conveyed especially in a scene the dramatic possibilities of which had been quite passed over in the Norse version—her recognition of the faithless Sigurd when she arrives in the Niblung hall. She has come, in accordance with her promise, to wed Gunnar; with queenly dignity and courtesy she has greeted him, his brother Hogni, and their attendant lords; she enters the hall, and there beside Gudrun sits Sigurd, on whose face she has not looked since he left her long before at Lyndale, with vows of everlasting love.

She stood with her hand in Gunnar's, and all about and around
Were the unfamiliar faces, and the folk that day had found;
But her heart ran back through the years, and yet her lips did move
With the words she spake on Hindfell, when they plighted troth of love.³

Sigurd, too, remembers, for the power of the potion has passed, and he is conscious of the treason he has wrought. So they gaze on each other.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

² P. 218.

³ P. 226.

Now she stands on the floor of the high-seat, and for e'en so little a space
As men may note delaying, she looketh on Sigurd's face,
Ere she saith:

"I have greeted many in the Niblungs' house today,
And for thee is the last of my greetings ere the feast shall wear away:
Hail, Sigurd, son of the Volsungs! hail, lord of Odin's storm!
Hail, rider of the wasteland and slayer of the Worm!
If aught thy soul shall desire while yet thou livest on earth,
I pray that thou mayest win it, nor forget its might and worth."¹

Sigurd returns her greeting with equal dignity and with a similar hidden meaning.

She heard and turned unto Gunnar as a queen that seeketh her place.

So she takes up her duties as Gunnar's wife. In the night time, as in the Eddic Lay, she wanders forth from the hall and wrestles with her jealousy. But she has no thought of avenging Sigurd's desertion of her. Calmly she moves through the days with "her fair face never smiling, and eyes that know no change." With most admirable self-restraint she even strives to keep on good terms with Gudrun.

Close now is her converse with Gudrun, and sore therein she strives
Lest the barren stark contention should mingle in their lives;
And she humbles her oft before her, as before the Queen of the earth,
The mistress, the overcomer, the winner of all that is worth:
And Gudrun beareth it all, and deemeth it little enow
Though the wife of Sigurd be worshipped; and the scorn in her heart
doth grow,
Of every soul save Sigurd.²

In the quarrel between the queens Gudrun is most to blame. At the sight of Andvari's ring and the revelation of the shameful trick played upon her, Brynhild's outward calm is broken and she is plunged in agony. Of the drink of forgetfulness she evidently knows nothing. She can scarcely comprehend Sigurd's treachery, and strives to believe that it is not so. She implores Gudrun,

"One thing I beseech thee and crave:
That thou speak but a word in thy turn my life and my soul to save:
—Yea the lives of many warriors, and the joy of the Niblung home,

¹ P. 227.

² P. 229.

And the days of the unborn children, and the health of the days to
come—

Say thou it was Gunnar thy brother that gave thee the Dwarf-lord's
ring,

And not the glorious Sigurd, the peerless lovely King."¹

And of Gunnar she begs:

"O tell me, Gunnar," she said, "that thou gav'st Andvari's ring
To thy sister the white-armed Gudrun! thou, not thy captain of war,
The son of the God-born Volsungs, the Lord of the treasure of yore!
O swear it that I may live! that I may be glad in thine hall."²

When the realization of the truth is forced upon her she feels
herself bitterly wronged and dishonored, false to her oath.

"Which one of the sons of Giuki," said Brynhild, "durst to ride
Through the waves of my Flickering Fire to lie by Brynhild's side?
Thou shouldst know him, O Sister of Kings; let the glorious name be
said,

Lest mine oath in the water be written, and I wake up, vile and betrayed,
In the arms of the faint-heart dastard, and of him that loveth life,
And casteth his deeds to another, and the wooing of his wife."³

These feelings, rather than jealousy, urge her on to the catastrophe. And Morris, in his portrayal of the situation, strives to make her act seem justified. Never is the trick played upon her presented as other than shameful. Sigurd himself is plunged in grief and remorse at the memory of his desertion of her and of the deception he practiced upon her when his mind was clouded by the potion.

Here, as in the Norse version, Brynhild sees that there is but one way out. She soliloquizes:

"O Sigurd, O my Sigurd, what now shall give me back
One word of thy loving-kindness from the tangle and the wrack?
O Norns, fast bound from helping, O Gods that never weep,
Ye have left stark death to help us, and the semblance of our sleep."⁴

The great scene with Sigurd is managed, in general, much as it is in the *Völsunga Saga*; but Morris' handling seems somewhat less effective. The contrast between his elaborate phrasing and the incisive brevity of his original is especially unfortunate here.

¹ P. 236.

² Pp. 243, 244.

³ P. 238.

⁴ P. 239.

In the following scene with Gunnar it is not necessary for Morris to present Brynhild as fiercely insisting on Sigurd's death. Gunnar, whose character at this point is rather skilfully managed, is already stirred by jealousy, suspicion, and envy of the Volsung's wealth and power. A word from his wife is sufficient to drive him to the deed.

Sigurd seems to accept as fitting the death which overtakes him.

"It is Brynhild's deed," he murmured, "and the woman that loves me well;
Nought now is left to repent of, and the tale abides to tell."¹

As in the Norse version, Brynhild kills herself, to join her love on the funeral pyre and follow him through the gates of Valhall.

Morris' poem has its faults. His long, dragging line, often clumsy, his frequent archaism and affectation of style, his obscure elaboration of phrasing, his redundancy—all these make him irritating at times. But when one gets used to his mannerisms, numerous virtues appear. He has, after all, the gift of story telling, and an enthusiastic appreciation of the spirit of these northern tales. He gives us many fine lines and imaginative passages—notably his accounts of the mysterious and supernatural episodes, such as the riding of the flames, the effect of the potion on Sigurd's mind, Sigurd's feelings when he changes into Gunnar's form. As for his Brynhild, she is softened and modernized, less torn by passion than the Norse figure, but on a lofty plane, striking especially in the dignity of a great queen.

In 1876, the year in which Morris' *Sigurd* was published, there took place at Bayreuth the first performance of Richard Wagner's great trilogy, *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, which he had begun twenty-six years before. In his expression of the old legend, Wagner of course made use of his new art-form—the music drama. If this had some disadvantages, it had also immense possibilities, for it enabled him to draw upon the combined resources of poetry, music, and the pictorial art of the stage. And by his powerful use of these he has made Brynhild

¹ P. 259.

live for the world as Morris' somewhat ponderous literary epic could never do.

Wagner drew some scenes and suggestions from the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Thidreksaga*, but the main line of his plot from the *Völsunga Saga*, with ideas from the Eddic lays and general Norse mythology. The necessities of the dramatic form of course forced him to modify and rearrange his material. This he did with a free hand. Under his treatment the character of Brünnhilde has gained immensely in unity. We have no longer any complexities of human fathers, foster-fathers, and domineering brothers and varied earthly residences. For the first time in her history, Brünnhilde is definitely placed in the ranks of the gods, as a divine valkyrie, favorite daughter of Wotan. And in all the supernatural glory of such a being she appears in the great opera which bears that name.

His embodiment of the old Norse conception of the valkyrie was probably the greatest triumph of Wagner's creative imagination. If one can temporarily banish his work from one's mind, the difficulty of representing such a figure visibly and audibly before a modern audience seems insuperable. But Wagner's portrayal of the battle-maidens of the air is altogether convincing. The wild, rocky hills, the gloom, the storm, the thunder, lightning flashes from swirling clouds, the maidens glittering in armor, their fierce, high-spirited glee, their wild shouts of greeting and exultation, above all the supernatural effect of the indescribable music, represent to perfection the spirit of the old Eddic lays, and even more.

Brünnhilde is one of these wild sisters. As in no other version of the tale, we see her as a valkyrie in action, and witness the events leading to her disobedience and punishment. It has often been pointed out that her character presents an admirable blending, contrast, and conflict of the divine pride of the goddess with the human emotions of the woman—affection, sympathy, generosity, and passionate love. The idea is prettily expressed in her early scene with Wotan, when, seeing her father in sorrow, she casts aside her valkyrie weapons, helmet, spear and shield, and sinks by his knee with the affectionate sympathy of a

loving daughter. She appears to warn Sigmund of his impending death in the solemn and awful dignity of a messenger from the gods. But her divine calm melts at the despair of the Volsung, and in a transport of generous sympathy she endeavors to save his life, though she must in so doing disobey her father's command. Her pity for the unfortunate Sieglinde and self-sacrificing efforts in her behalf are among the most moving episodes in the story. In the great scene with Wotan, before he leaves her in slumber, surrounded by the magic fire, she pleads her cause with touching dignity. Her horror at the mortal wedlock to which he has condemned her, her proud prayer that at least her slumber may be surrounded by such dangers that no coward may win her for his wife, her final rush to her father's arms—all this is a happy blending of the human and the divine. Again in the awakening scene with Siegfried, appears her proud unwillingness to stoop to the lot of a mere mortal woman, yielding place at last to the exultation of passionate love and utter surrender to the young hero. Even to avert the fall of all the gods, she will not give up the ring which is his marriage gift. It is noticeable that in Wagner's version, unlike most of the others, Siegfried and Brünnhilde are actually united in wedlock.

Wagner's arrangement of the plot necessitates another considerable change in Brünnhilde's character. The motive of her fidelity to the oath which she had sworn to wed the man who should pass the fire is no longer present. She weds Siegfried, the predestined awakener. When he goes forth to seek fresh glory, she remains on her fire-girt rock awaiting his return. When she hears his horn and springs forward to meet him, only to see suddenly against the flames the dark form of a stranger—perhaps the most dramatic moment in the trilogy—no oath constrains her to yield herself to him. She greets him with horror, and submits only to force, when he tears from her the ring. There is some loss in the dropping of the older idea, but much gain. The plot certainly becomes simpler and more logical.

This change and the necessary compression of events also alter the succeeding scene. Brünnhilde does not come to Gunther's hall voluntarily, bound by her oath. She is led thither by Gun-

ther, an unwilling captive, pale and sad amid the splendidly barbaric greeting of the vassals. The culmination of the tragedy has to follow at once. Her horror at the sight of the still unconscious Siegfried smiling by Gutrune's side; her pathetic cry, "Siegfried . . . kennt mich nicht?" her realization, at the sight of the ring on his finger, that it was he who obtained her for Gunther; her instant and fierce accusation of him; his innocently perjured oath on the spear point; her passionate contradiction—all make a scene of extraordinary dramatic power. It would be hard to find a more striking portrayal of the wrath and indignation of a woman bitterly wronged.

The necessary compression of the story at this point forced Wagner to omit some admirable portions of the Saga, such as Brynhild's great scene with Sigurd. Her psychology is different here. Without much chance for analyzing her motives, she is hurried on to the catastrophe. Maddened by the sudden revelation of Siegfried's faithlessness and treachery, of the cause of which she is ignorant, she consents to plot his death with Hagen. Of course it is too much to expect that Brünnhilde should submit not only to Siegfried's deserting her for Gutrune, but also to his actually obtaining her by trickery for another man. This was really the last straw, especially for the proud nature of a valkyrie. And yet—and yet— Somehow it is hard for us to feel, nowadays, that one is justified under *any* circumstances in planning to have one's lover stabbed in the back. And when we actually see and hear Brünnhilde doing it, it is rather distressing. Wagner might have managed this more happily.

But she redeems herself in the last scene, when, having learned of Siegfried's innocence, she joins him in death. The fierce valkyrie nature breaks forth at the very last, when with the old cry of exultation she leaps upon Grani's back and plunges into the burning pyre.

Wagner has chosen to represent in Brünnhilde the triumph of love, the supremacy of which she proclaims at the end. By her last sacrifice the curse on the gold is expiated, and a new and happier era dawns. I doubt if one person in fifty gets any such idea from the drama. It is not for his philosophy that we go to

hear Wagner's works, nor for her allegorical significance that we value Brünnhilde.

With all its faults, the trilogy of the *Ring* is the greatest embodiment of the old tale. More fortunate than the Arthurian legend, the Volsung story has found artistic expression in a work of the first rank. In the portrayal of Brünnhilde's character Wagner was especially happy. He avoided here his worst fault, for she is never tiresomely loquacious, except perhaps in her last scene. She is more passionate and unrestrained, less modern, than Morris' Brynhild. And in her union of divine loftiness with the emotions of a noble woman, she seems to be, among all Wagner's characters, his greatest creation—a figure “exceeding glorious.”

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE

NEW YORK

MUSICAL ACCENT AND DOUBLE ALLITERATION IN THE *EDDA*

In Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXXIII, pp. 95 ff., there appeared an article by B. Q. Morgan, "Zur Lehre von der Alliteration in der Westgermanischen Dichtung."¹ This is an investigation of the relation between the alliteration and the musical accent of the line. The author finds from a study of *Beowulf* that each half-line contains a leading musical pitch which he designates as "führton." By this is not meant any fixed musical note, but a pitch which is to be determined separately for each line by the reader's natural feeling. If two accented syllables in the same half-line have the same "führton," i. e., if they are on the same musical pitch, he calls them "gleichtonig." Any tone which varies from the "führton" he calls "ausweichton" and distinguishes two degrees of the same, "nahton" and "fernton," according to the remoteness from the "führton." Morgan deduces from his results the following rule: "Hebungen mit führton müssen alliterieren, hebungen mit nahton dürfen alliterieren, müssen es aber nicht; hebungen mit fernton sind von der alliteration mit hebungen anderer tonstufe ausgeschlossen." This new rule is intended to supplement or even supersede the old rule of rhythmic stress accent laid down by Sievers (*Altgermanische Metrik*, § 30, 1).

It is not my purpose to try either to verify or to disprove any part of Morgan's work, which seems to be a very accurate and painstaking investigation. But I have been interested in seeing whether his rule can be applied to the North Germanic poetry; and for this purpose I have read the *Vǫluspá*, *Thrymskviða*, *Hymiskviða*, and *Baldrs Draumar*, trying in the case of each half-line to see whether, according to my natural feeling, the two accented syllables were on the same musical pitch or not; and this entirely regardless of whether they were first-half or second-half

¹A paper on the same subject was read by Morgan before the Modern Language Association in Columbus, O., on December 28, 1907.

lines, or whether the alliteration was single or double. I must confess that I am a little skeptical about a study of this kind, particularly if one starts out with a preconceived opinion as to the intonation with which a certain line ought to be read. It seems that some lines can be read (always of course in the context) on either a high or a low equal pitch ("gleichton"), or even with a varying pitch ("ausweichton"), and one about as naturally as another.

Again, it is not always easy for the ear to detect whether two syllables are on the same pitch or no; sometimes a strong stress accent can be mistaken for a change of pitch, when on more careful examination it will turn out that such is not the case; similarly, the inflection of the voice on an unaccented syllable of a polysyllabic word is often misleading, in cases where the two accented syllables of the half-line are on the same pitch. Those lines which seemed capable of two or more intonations I have studied carefully, called in the help of another, and have tried always to decide in favor of the reading which seemed most natural. Of course it is hard to be natural when observing oneself so closely. I have set about my task with an entirely unprejudiced mind, or if anything, rather with the expectation that my results would agree with Morgan's.

He finds that of the 1,542 first half-lines in *Beowulf* which show double alliteration 1,486 are on the same musical pitch; that of the 1,582 first half-lines with single alliteration 1,550 are not on the same pitch; furthermore, of the last half-lines (in which, as is known, there is always only one alliterating word) he finds only 42 which can be read on the same pitch. These proportions are of course sufficient to justify him in deducing his rule that accented syllables of the same pitch can alliterate, others not. The following are my results for the *Vpłospp*. (I omitted those strophes which contain only a list of proper names, and repeated lines were counted only once.) Of the 195 first half-lines in which the two arses are on the same pitch, only 78 have double alliteration, and of the 30 with varying pitch, 17 have also double alliteration. Thus it will be seen that here only 40 per cent. of the lines with "gleichton" show double alliteration, whereas nearly

56 per cent. of those with "ausweichton" also have double alliteration. On the other hand, I find that 77 per cent. of the last half-lines are to be read with "gleichton" of the two stressed syllables. I do not mean to assert that the converse of Morgan's rule will apply to the *Edda*, but only that these figures do not permit its application to this poem at least. And of course I have the same right to suppose that my natural intonation of these lines will coincide with that of most readers, as has Morgan to make this supposition for *Beowulf*.

The figures in the case of the other poems are in some respects even more extreme than for the *Vǫluspá*. In the *Thrymskviða*, of the 77 first half-lines with even pitch, only 19 have double alliteration, i. e., only 24 per cent.; and of the 30 with varying pitch 5 have double alliteration. On the other hand, in the last half-lines I read with even pitch 65 of the 107, or over 60 per cent. (here again lines repeated in the poem were counted only once).¹

As regards those lines not on an even pitch and yet with double alliteration, it might be suggested by someone that the difference in pitch is not so great as to preclude the alliteration. But I have not been able to carry out Morgan's distinction between "nahton" and "fernton," and furthermore, I am of the opinion that a very great degree of difference in pitch would not prevent alliteration. This is certainly true of alliteration between half-lines. Very often the alliterating word of the second half-line is clearly far removed in pitch from that of the first half-line. And it is this variation in pitch between the half-lines and adjoining full-lines rather than the variation within the half-line, that keeps the reading from being monotonous. Morgan says on p. 97: "Es scheint aber, als lägen auch die führtöne der beiden halbzeilen

¹ *Hymiskviða*: First half-line with even pitch, 109, with uneven pitch, 43; second half-line with even pitch, 96, with uneven pitch, 56; even pitch and double alliteration, 40; uneven pitch and double alliteration, 22.

Baldur's Draumar: First half-line with even pitch, 40, with uneven pitch, 11; second half-line with even pitch, 38, with uneven pitch, 13; even pitch and double alliteration, 10; uneven pitch and double alliteration, 0.

It did not seem advisable or necessary to burden this short article with a list of all of the lines, indicating the musical accent of each. If anyone should desire the figures they can be had upon request. I believe that anyone who will experiment for himself with a few strophes of these poems will notice that a majority of the half-lines are read with even pitch of the arses, regardless of double alliteration.

eines langverses innerhalb derselben zone." I have not tested this for *Beowulf*, but it does not seem to hold good generally for these poems of the *Edda*. On the contrary, a marked difference in the pitch of the alliterating words of the two half-lines would be quite parallel to a strong stress-accent, i. e., it would make the words stand out clearly in the general intonation of the whole line and render them particularly suitable for bearing the alliteration. E. g., str. 17 of the *Thrymskv*:

Mik mono æsir | argan kalla.

the voice rises for the word "argan." Here, as generally, the musical and stress-accent fall on the same word, "argan," and the former simply accentuates the latter. There are half-lines, however, in which the alliterating word is followed by one which bears a stronger stress accent, e. g.:

Thrymskv. 5: þá fló Loki | fjaðrhamr dunpe,

Thrymskv. 15: bindom Þór þá | brúþar líne,

Thrymskv. 30: bereþ inn hamar | brúpe at vígja.

In these lines the nouns "Loki," "Þór," and "hamar" have according to the sense a stronger rhythmical accent, but the preceding alliterating verbs have a much higher musical pitch; and in each case the alliterating word of the second half-line lies on a very low pitch. It seems that this very difference in musical accent is the element which satisfied the poet's feeling for the alliteration. Or perhaps we shall have to say that the high musical pitch added to whatever stress-accent the word has in the line would be sufficient to make this word stand out more prominently than the word with the stronger stress-accent.¹

Is it not true then that in some cases in the *Edda* there seems to be a relation between alliteration and change of pitch, rather than as Morgan finds for *Beowulf*, between alliteration and "gleichton"? At any rate the Norse poets do not seem to have felt that every pair of equal musical pitches had to alliterate, nor on the other hand that words of a different pitch could not be thus joined together. His statement (p. 98) that: "ist der tonabstand

¹Cf. J. W. Bright, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XIV, new series, Vol. VII, 1899, pp. 345 ff.

zweier hebungen sehr gross, so wäre deren bindung durch alliteration geradezu stilwidrig, weil diese gewaltsam zusammenbringen würde, was sonst getrennt ist," cannot, I believe, be applied to the *Edda*.

As to the verse types, Morgan thinks that he can find in the musical accent an explanation of the fact that the B and C types so seldom have double alliteration. He says (p. 96), "dass die zweite hebung von B gern im tone ausweicht und bei C fällt der tonsprung zwischen erster und zweiter hebung meist noch viel deutlicher ins ohr." Now in the *Vǫluspá* I find that in only 3 of the 39 B-type verses and in only 28 of the 132 C-type verses are the two stresses of the half-line to be read on a different pitch; in by far the larger part then they are on the same pitch. I doubt whether the musical intonation will throw any light on the relation between verse types and double alliteration.

To what is all this difference between the *Beowulf* and the *Edda* to be attributed? Is it due solely to the fact that two persons carried on the investigations? Is this musical intonation purely a personal matter, or is one justified in assuming that most readers will give the lines practically the same musical as well as stress-accent? If the latter be the case then we are confronted with the problem: Why is the number of lines with even pitch so much greater in the *Edda* than in the *Beowulf*? I thought at first that the answer in the case of the *Vǫluspá* was to be found in the fact that this whole poem consists of the solemn narrative of the prophetess, in which we might expect to find a high even pitch sustained. But the figures are not materially different for the others, poems full of action. It seems to me that the solution is rather to be sought in the difference in style of *Beowulf* and the *Edda*. As is well known (cf. Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik*, §30c) the running-over of one long line into the next is characteristic of the West Germanic stichic verse. The tendency to end a sentence with the first half-line and begin a new one with the second half-line is very marked in the Anglo-Saxon poetry. The epic variation is one of the most important devices by which the poet maintains this style. If the sentence would naturally end with the long line he carries it over through the

first half of the next line by adding one of those parenthetical or appositional phrases which simply emphasize what has already been said without advancing the narrative.

But in the strophic poetry of the *Edda* the long line developed as the unit, and we generally find the sentence ending with the last half-line, with no pause at all or only a slight one after the first half. The epic variation so common in *Beowulf* is very rare in the *Edda*. The apposition or parallelism which does occur is generally between two long-lines, each being a complete unit. E. g., *Thrymskv.* 14:

Senn vǫro æsir | aller á þinge
ok ósynjor | allar á male,

or in Strophe 4:

Mendak gefa þér | þótt ór golle være
ok þó selja | at ór silfre være.

But there is not even a great deal of this sort of variation. The poet does not linger and comment on a situation or an act as in *Beowulf*, but rushes on with his narrative. Now where there is no syntactical break at the end of the first half-line the voice would naturally show a tendency to sustain on the second arsis the pitch of the first in its effort to rush on and finish the sentence:¹ e. g., in *Thrymskv.* 26:

Sat en alsnotra | ambott fyrer,

or Strophe 21:

Senn vǫro hafrar | heim of rekner,

or 16:

Lótom und hónom | hrynja lukla,

or 7:

Hefr þu Hlóriða | hamar of folgenn?

In all these the two stressed syllables of the first half-line seem to be on the same musical pitch. Morgan does not seem to me to

¹ This would also apply to those second half-lines in which the sentence runs over into the following line.

be right when he says of such lines (p. 102): "die leise erregtheit des vortrags hindert den gleichton." Of course some lines of this kind show varying pitch, but this is generally due to some special emphasis of a word, e.g., *Thrymskv.* 10:

seg þú á lopte | lönq tífende.

Where "lopte" is on a high pitch, the thought being, "tell me while still in the air; do not wait to alight." But these are exceptional cases. In general the pitch of the two stressed syllables will be practically the same. So we may say that if it be true that the *Edda* contains a greater number of half-lines with equal pitch than *Beowulf*, this fact may be due partly to the closer syntactical unity of the full line in the *Edda*.

There is a further explanation of this preponderance of even pitch in the *Edda* (and this will apply to both the first and second half-lines). As remarked above, the musical and stress accents generally coincide, i.e., a stronger stress accent is likely to be accompanied by a change in pitch, generally a rise of the voice; and if the two accented syllables of a half-line have the same stress accent they will generally be on the same pitch. In such cases we have to do with two strongly stressed syllables, and since they must be uttered on some pitch or other, if the two be on the same pitch we are hardly justified in speaking of a musical accent at all, the essential element of which is a change in pitch. Of course it is perfectly plausible to speak of two syllables as being on the same pitch, but this is a statement which one arrives at after it has been observed through a *difference* in the pitch of two syllables that musical accent is something which exists apart from dynamic accent. So long as we deal solely with stressed syllables of the same pitch the idea of a musical accent does not occur to us. In the case of those half-lines, then, in which the two accented syllables are on the same pitch, we can in a certain sense eliminate the conception of a musical accent and say that the dynamic accent predominates.

Now, if it be true that *Beowulf* contains many more half-lines with varying pitch than the *Edda*, i.e., if the musical accent plays a very important rôle in the former, while in the latter the dynamic

accent is the predominating one, this is quite in accord with the characteristic styles of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian poetry. Hoffmann ("Der bildliche Ausdruck in *Beowulf* und in der *Edda*," *Englische Studien*, VI, 163-216), was the first to call attention to the fact that the *Beowulf* poet strives constantly to appeal to the emotions of the reader or listener, whereas in the *Edda* the appeal is chiefly to the intellect and the imagination. Now we know (cf. Hempl, *German Orthography and Phonology*, p. 165) that emotion effects a change in the tension of the muscles, which results in a change of the pitch of the voice. Musical accent is the natural accompaniment and symbol of emotional activity. On the other hand, "that idea that most keenly busies the mind is expressed with most vigor, or stress of the voice." Thus stress accent is the natural accompaniment and symbol of mental activity. It is only to be expected then, that in the *Beowulf* the pitch accent would predominate, in the *Edda* the dynamic.

Whatever may be the status of musical accent in the *Beowulf* and in the *Edda*, the fact remains that double alliteration occurs much less frequently in the latter: *Beowulf*, about 50 per cent.; *Vǫluspá*, 45 per cent.; *Thrymskv.* 24 per cent.; *Hymis Kvíða*, 38 per cent.; *Baldur's Draumar*, 18 per cent.; *Helga Kvíða Hundingsbana*, I and II, 25 per cent.; *Rígsþula*, 30 per cent.; *Hyndluljóð*, 30 per cent.; *Vǫl en Skamma*, 13 per cent. Only poems in fornyrðislag strophe can well be compared with *Beowulf*. This too may be due partly to the more highly developed unity of the long-line as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon half-line and the running-over of the last half into the first half of the next line. In the *Edda* where the two half-lines are bound closely together syntactically; where the sentence generally begins with the first half-line and ends with the second, and the two half-lines are not separated by any pause or at most by only a slight one, the ear is satisfied by one alliterating word in each half-line. The poet did not feel any great need of a double alliteration. But where, as is frequent in *Beowulf*, the two parts of the long-line are separated by strong punctuation (period, colon, or semicolon, so called "closed" half-lines) and by a marked pause of the voice; where the first half-line is often very closely connected syntacti-

cally with the preceding line and not at all with its own last half-line, then a double alliteration in this first half is almost necessary in order to produce the desired effect for the ear. If the line is split between two sentences then it must be held together more closely by a clear, well-marked alliteration.

This agrees very well with Morgan's figures for *Beowulf*. He finds that 471 of the 646 closed first half-lines show double alliteration, but he associates the phenomenon only with their even pitch. It cannot of course be affirmed that single alliteration occurs only in the open first half-lines and double in the closed (for the *Edda* contains very few closed first half-lines); only that the closed type would be very favorable to the development of double alliteration and the open, on the other hand, would be satisfied with a single. It is true, however, that in the *Edda*, whenever a first half-line is more closely connected grammatically with the preceding line than with its own last half-line, and in the few cases of epic variation we generally find double alliteration. This is particularly noticeable in the *Vǫluspá* in which double alliteration is almost as frequent as in *Beowulf*. E.g., Strophe 27:

á sér ausask | aurgom forse,
vepe Valfǫr. | Vitǫ enn eða hvat?

Strophe 28:

Ein sat úte, | þas aldenn kom
yggjongr asa, | ok í augo leit.

Strophe 32:

Varp af meipe, | es mæR sýndesk,
harmflaug hættleg; | Höfr nam skjóta.

or with epic variation, Strophe 9:

Gengo regen ǫll | á rǫkstóla,
ginnheilög goð, | ok of þat gættosk:

Let me say again that this article is not intended as a polemic

against Morgan's work. It would in no sense be fair to condemn his work in *Beowulf* by testing his theory on the *Edda*. Nor am I perhaps justified in generalizing for the whole *Edda*, my results obtained from examining only four poems. I only affirm that Morgan's theory of the relation between double alliteration and musical accent cannot be applied generally to Scandinavian alliterative poetry.

C. M. LOTSPEICH

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

MEDIAEVAL LATIN LYRICS

PART IV

APPENDIX¹

The five methods referred to on page 85 above are as follows:

1. *If a poem appear in an earlier or better text elsewhere than in a German MS, the presumption is that it is of foreign extraction.* The weakness of this method and its attendant dangers are obvious; I have already called attention to them in a discussion of Jeanroy's thesis that French lyrics were the source of German lyrics in the twelfth century (*Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 412 f.). Particular care must be exercised in the application of this chronological test to mediaeval profane songs which in both France and Germany were often not documented until one or more generations after the poems were composed; not written down at least in MSS which have descended to us. Often we owe our knowledge of the existence of profane poetry at a certain time to the merest chance, such as the scribbling of a refrain on a margin of MS to test the scribe's pen before he began an initial, such as a phrase at the heading of a serious piece to give the tune it should be sung by, such as a chance reference in homily or sermon, or a tale like that of the Worcester priest in Gerald's *Gemma ecclesiastica* who said *Swete lemman, dhin are* (sweet mistress, thy favor) instead of the expected *Dominus vobiscum* (*Opera Giraldi*, Vol. II, p. 120; Schofield, *op. cit.*, p. 445; Sandys, *Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, Vol. I, p. 219). The age and the provenience of a song can thus be but rarely determined with absolute definiteness.

And as to the "better" text we may not always safely judge. Opinion may differ as to which of two or three texts is best; and if we agree that one form of a poem be preferable, the longest, finest and clearest variant is not necessarily the first one. Quite the contrary often, for we sometimes learn how one poet after another changed and added to a piece until it reached final shape.

2. *If vernacular phrases mingle with the Latin words of a poem, it is probably original in the land whose language these phrases represent.* Here again we cannot attain definite results, particularly in macaronic Middle English lyrics (cf. Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*; ten Brink,

¹ It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge the vital help and encouragement I have received from Mr. George L. Hamilton, of the University of Michigan, and Mr. Edward K. Rand, of Harvard University. I wish the merit of my performance better justified their kindly offices in its behalf. My colleagues Mr. John M. Manly and Mr. Karl Pietsch have likewise been unflinching in criticism and suggestion.

Gesch. d. engl. Lit., Vol. I², p. 354). At one time, to be sure, all Europe that was ambitious to learn went or longed to go to the French schools, just as later it looked to Italy as the fount of its inspiration. Thus it was possible for an Englishman like Hilary, or a German lad like the author of *Urbs salve regia*, to write a lyric with French words in it or a French refrain to it. At times this song is cut according to the Paris school-jib and perhaps had for its model some French student song; at times the student made a bran-new poem, incorporating in it the personal knowledge and experience gained at the French school, and thus wrote a piece not inherently English or German, but French. Sometimes, however, French words occur in a poem the whole cast of which otherwise is German. Besides which we know that vernacular words were in a few cases inserted in Latin pieces long after they were written. The presence in a song of German or English words indicates nationality more than French words do, for during the whole twelfth century the latter tongue was a sort of *lingua franca* for cultured Europe.

3. *Specific allusion to a country or to its customs and institutions may indicate the original home of a poem.* I have shown with what circumspection this test must be used in my discussion of Nos. 51 and 88 above. Such instances can be multiplied in Latin poems which do not occur in the Benedictbeuern MS; the German's song of farewell to his beloved Swabia, for example, which I have quoted above, p. 24, n. 3, can scarcely be thought of as copied from a French original. In the Germany of the twelfth century, as six hundred years later, Paris was *die hauptstadt der welt* and France the fabled land of romance. We should, therefore, expect to hear echoes of this in Latin songs of German manufacture.

4. *The versification of a song may so closely resemble that of a poet or group of poets outside of Germany that the piece can be assigned to them.* Any application of this test must necessarily rest mainly upon the well-known studies in mediaeval Latin rhythms published by Wilhelm Meyer (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 2 vols, 1905). Schreiber first put this method forth to determine which of the Latin songs in the *Carmina burana* were of German origin, in his *Die Vagantenstrophe* (1894). His conception of Latin rhythms was colored by Meyer's essay *über die lateinischen Rythmen* (*Sitzungsber. d. Münchener Akad.*, 1882, I) and Dreves' *Petri Abaelardi hymnarius* (1891), aided here and there by the views of Richard M. Meyer, Martin, Burdach, and Wallensköld. For the sake of discussion I should be willing to accept many of the more general statements of Schreiber about mediaeval lyric measures as true. But when he would apply his results to individual poems in the *Carmina burana* and thus decide which songs are French, which songs German, it is not safe to follow.

For practically every text in the Benedictbeuern MS has to be recon-

structed before its rhythm can be known. Such restored versions are based in nearly every instance at least partly on guesswork—subtle and clever guessing sometimes, but none the less guessing. The foundation of Schreiber's argument is, therefore, at any one moment shaky, often unscientific. The Bacon authorship of Shakespeare can be made many times more plausible than it is if each investigator of the problem be permitted to add and subtract at will. In one poem of five stanzas (No. 109) Schreiber has conjectured the following words: *denuo, lepida, victa, feminae, libere, a diis, Taydis, attamen, unico, spatio, oculi, absque te, sine te, mihi nunc, tu*, and the inflectional ending *-eres*. Does the sense require these additions? No; the piece is an intelligible and poetic whole without them. Why did he add them then? In order to get three additional syllables in three verses of each stanza and thus bring the poem up to the form he presupposed. Where did he get these words? Partly from the *Altercatio Ganymedis et Helenae* (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 127 f.; *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Pt. II, pp. 274 f.), partly out of his own head. Is there any proven connection between the *altercatio* and No. 109? No.

Supposing we should thus remold Browning, or Tennyson, trimming them up with chosen bits from Shelley or Coleridge. It makes the perspiration start but to imagine it. What with garbled texts then, and with all reasonable allowance for similarity, coincidence even, of meter and rhythm, I cannot agree to the employment of verse-tests to bring about a final decision as to the origin of a song, in a period where we are still so much in the dark as here.

Schreiber, however, treated only the *vagantenstrophe*. Lundius has come to carry on the verse-test method by examining all the technical details of the Benedictbeuern Latin songs to get criteria to determine their birthplace (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 330-493). He assumes a time of efflorescence with a certain definite art-technique; this period is one which comprises Adam of St. Victor, Walter of Chatillon, the St. Omer Songs, the poems of the Archpoet, the songs printed by Wright, and the great mass of hymns published by Mone and Dreves! A period, that is, that lasted several hundred years, that stretched from London to Rome and included three or four of the great cultural nations of modern Europe. The art of this period, Lundius states, is marked by several definite characteristics. Where these are deviated from, something is wrong; perhaps the song is German. *Exempli gratia*, "the art of the period of bloom . . . strictly preserved the number of syllables in a verse" (p. 335). "On the contrary in the songs of our collection we meet frequently offenses against the syllabic equality of lines. This phenomenon finds a simple explanation if one posits the influence of the German national metrical law as the cause of the disturbance" (p. 461). Forty-

nine pieces are discovered to offend against the law of syllable equality — Lundius declares these pieces German. Likewise, thirty or more of the songs in the *Carmina burana* have especially impure rhyme (p. 476), the rhymes of the St. Omer songs are particularly pure, therefore "impurity of rhyme is a characteristic of German songs." And so on. And so forth.

I am not aiming at Lundius. His performance, or rather the vast detail of it, impresses me somewhat. Verse-tests carried out no more faithfully than his have blazed the way for our understanding of whole sorts and times of poetic effort; Chaucer, for instance, and his relation to fourteenth-century English meters. But we know Chaucer was an Englishman; who and what (man or men) was the Archpoet? We know within narrow compass the dates of Chaucer's writings. When was written "the great mass of hymns published in Mone and Dreves?" What did Walter of Chatillon write? Just the *Alexandreis* and a few stilted narrative poems, or a swarm of songs like those "commonly attributed to Mapes"? And finally, what text of a song may be trusted? That one which Wilhelm Meyer (to name but the great name) has "restored" shortly before he makes a sweeping assertion that "up to now I have found only in Germany Latin songs of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries with disparate number of syllables"? (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Vol. I, p. 250.)

This tireless investigator has recently extended his study of the syllabic inequality in earlier Latin verses and believes the phenomenon to be caused by the influence of the old German four-stressed line (*Vierheber*); cf. "Ein Merowinger Rythmus u. altdeutsche Rythmik in lateinischen Versen," *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 31-81. But clearly as he is able to show the disturbing influence of such ictus on the usually schematic Latin line, helpful as the results of his study may be in strengthening our belief that certain poems are of German workmanship, there is undoubted danger, in the light of our present knowledge, in making the unsupported assertion that every Latin line whose syllables are apparently influenced by such ictus is German in origin.

Meyer himself cites the case of Dhuoda's poems (cf. Bondurant, *Le manuel de Dhuoda* [1887], pp. 47, 225, 228, 240; Traube, *Karolingische Dichtungen* [1888], pp. 141-148). Dhuoda was married in Aachen in the year 824, was duchess of Septimania, and wrote her verses in Uzès near the lower Rhone. Meyer acknowledges that she scarcely can have had anything to do with German verse-makers, but surmises, on the basis of his syllable-test alone, that she may have been the daughter of a Frankish house, and either in her parents' home or in her own have come to know the agreeable, fresh and diversified Franco-German popular rhythms and to use them to enliven the monotonous Latin rhythmical form of her four poems. To the query why Dhuoda did not imitate the native, popular

Gallic rhythms, Meyer answers that the existence of old French and Provençal poems at that time must first be proved.

Except as contributory evidence, to join with other testimony of the paternity of a poem in order to establish its birthplace, I do not think we can yet accept either impure rhyme or syllabic inequality.

5. *Internal testimony (such as treatment of theme, symbolism, manner) may suggest an un-German source for a song.* This I believe to be the worst and the best of all five methods—according as we administer it. At its worst the method is utterly untrustworthy, for it is based upon some preconceived assumption. To give an illustration: There is a widespread belief, which I have already referred to, that German poets during the twelfth century, whether secular or clerical, were less able to write a correct Latin song than their French brethren. It may be true that the French were the authors of all the mediaeval Latin lyrics worth the having; but how shall we prove it? The Archpoet may still be a German, if you wish, and so may an occasional poet in the *Carmina burana*. It is unsafe to decide against an anonymous Latin lyric of springtime and love as a German production, just because one rather gathers without the slightest show of reason that to be German in the twelfth century one must be comparatively stupid.

At its best the fifth method is subjective. It demands that others see the matter as do we, and there is no absolute analytical test that it can employ to educe proof. But, if we are careful, this method leads to suggestive if not final results and joins with other tests to establish as great certainty as we may reach until fuller revelation comes. It is no preconceived assumption that the presence of one kind of style, diction, word-vocabulary, one manner of theme-treatment, one type of figurative imagery, has always been an inalienable part of popular German poetry. If we are right in thinking now and again that we get strong hints of such *volkslied*-symbolism in a Latin lyric, the presumption is that the latter is somehow German in origin. We don't know much about the stupidity of twelfth-century German lyric poets, but we do know something of their manner of writing; for it is on the one hand documented in early *minnesang*, on the other hand we may reason at times from the analogy of later texts. Just as surely do we know something of early French popularizing poetry: the *pastourelle* and the *romance*, for example. These types exhibit in their turn a certain style and diction. We cannot be sure all French poets that wrote Latin were bright, but we may decide that a Latin lyric is French in origin, if it show the verbal figurative atmosphere of a French *chansonnette*.

We need not be surprised to discover that the more mechanical and mathematical methods of studying a Latin lyric which was wafted across Europe for two centuries are not always the safest. Nor may we rightly

scoff at applying in our study the test of style and diction. Let us only mock when the application is not intelligently or honestly made.

"Modern" nature-sense.—It has been often felt that a dividing line may be established between antique and modern treatment of nature in epic and lyric verse. Nature description in the classical poets, particularly the Romans, is sometimes held to be a bye-production, an occasional embellishment, a thing to be done with a few strokes, more indicated than carried out in detail (cf. Baehrens, *Unedirte lateinische Gedichte* [1877], p. 35); whereas modern art has assigned to nature an independent importance, sentimentalizes its every delicate particular, discovers in it a latent sympathy for every possible human emotion.

I doubt if this difference of attitude toward nature should be made a criterion of different ages of poetic art. I believe it rather a distinguishing characteristic of separate kinds of poetry within the same period. One sort of nature treatment is epic (objective), the other lyric (subjective); the first kind views nature from without, the other sees it from within. Any period of poetic art of which we have full record would, I believe, show both attitudes. This statement is important for one reason, if for no other. We speak of the "evolution of nature-sense in poetry," as if it were something that grows from an original grain of mustard until it becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. Rather, I imagine, does this nature-sense dwell in every age, to come to fuller expression in such times as are most given to the writing of lyrical poetry. Did we not know for example that the following description of nature occurred in the Easter-sequence of Notker, we might well imagine it the work of Adam of St. Victor nearly three hundred years later:

Favent igitur
 resurgenti Christo cuncta gaudiis:
 Flores, segetes
 redivivo fructu vernant,
 et volucres
 gelu tristi terso dulce jubulant.
 Lucent clarius
 sol et luna morte Christi turbida;
 Tellus herbida
 resurgenti plaudit Christo,
 quae tremula
 ejus morte se casuram minitat.

Cf. Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen*, Vol. I, p. 201, Schubinger, *Die Sängerschule St. Gallens*, p. 48, Winterfeld, *Neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, p. 355, Gautier, *Œuvres d'Adam de S. V.*, Vol. I, p. 82:

Mundi renovatio
 nova parit gaudia,
 Resurgenti domino
 conresurgunt omnia.

Similar nature-parallelism of a direct kind was frequent enough in secular poems of St. Gall and Reichenau, if we believe the testimony of the songs of welcome which Walafrid, Ratpert, and Notker addressed to visiting sovereigns, e. g.:

Innovatur nostra laetos
Terra flores proferens;
Ver novum praesentat aestas,
Dum datur te cernere.

Plus hodie solito radiat sol clarus in alto,
Cumque serena venis nubila cuncta teris.
Floribus arva nitent, quia te nos visere cernunt,
Poetibus atque solum germinat omne bonum.

Haec ipsa gaudent tempora,
Florequ verno germinant
Adventus omni gaudio,
Quando venit optatior.

There is nothing in the tone of these nature-pictures to remind one of the ninth or tenth century.

But, no matter! Suppose we feel it incumbent upon us to keep the adjective "modern" when speaking of nature treatment in poetry. Then we must make this word so elastic that it includes the fourth century of our era. For such verses as the *Pervigilium Veneris* or one of the poems ascribed to Tiberianus (not mentioned by Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*!) are colored by "modern" sentiment.

Amnis ibat inter arva valle fusus frigida,
Luce ridens calculorum, flore pictus herbido.
Caerulas superne laurus et virecta myrtea
Leniter motabat aura blandiente sibilo;
Subtus autem molle gramen flore adulto creverat:
Tum croco solum rubebat et lucebat liliis
Et nemus fragrabat omne violarum sub spiritu.
Inter ista dona veris gemmeasque gratias
Omnium regina odorum vel colorum Lucifer
Aureo flore eminebat cura Cypridis rosa.
Antra muscus et virentes intus myrtus vinxerant.
Roscidum nemus rigeat inter uda gramina:
Fonte crebro murmurabant hinc et inde rivuli;
Quae fluentia labibunda guttis ibant lucidis.
Has per umbras omnis ales plus canora quam putes
Cantibus vernis strepebat et susurris dulcibus;
Hic loquentis murmur amnis concinebat frondibus,
Quis melos vocalis aurae musa zef, ri moverat.
Sic euntem per virecta pulchra odora et musica
Ales amnis aura lucus flos et umbra juverat.

Cf. Baehrens, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

Recovering a song.—To reconstruct the text of a lyric poem on the basis of a single corrupt MS is technically an inadmissible thing. The temptation to do so has, however, assailed most investigators of mediaeval poetry and many have been their lapses from grace. For several years I was sorely tried by No. 89 of the *Carmina burana*. The theme of it was,

it seemed to me, "When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be," or as the libertine Serlo of Wilton expressed it: "Dum fero languorem, / fero religionis amorem; / Expers languoris, / non sum memor hujus amoris." Cf. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques MSS*, Vol. I, p. 314; II, p. 213. We have a prose rendering of the same story in Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*, cap. XVI (ed. Stange, 1851; cf. also Kaufmann, *Zeitschr. des Vereins für rheinische Geschichte*, Vol. I, 1862). The archpoet Nicolaus, fearing a mortalsickness, joins the Cistercians, but when danger is past he throws off his cowl with a jest and flees; cf. *Leipziger Blätter für Pädagogik*, Vol. VI (1872), p. 41. Our poem contains three eight-versed stanzas, indicating the liveliest sort of dialogue between a stricken son afraid of death and wishing therefore to take vows and a father who urges against such a step. At the end comes swiftly and without warning a quick break of mood worthy of Heine. These three stanzas form a whole that is light, witty, and dramatic, if we change two evident mistakes (*frater* thrice to *pater*; *floribus* to *fletibus*), and allow the substitution of the feminine gender for the masculine in the last three verses of the second eight-versed stanza). Without this change, the piece was, I thought, to be regarded as either incoherent or sodomitic.

Between the first two eight-versed stanzas, however, come ten quatrains didactic in tendency, retarding the action, broadly animadverting upon the contrasts of heavenly and earthly life. In a word, our poem at once becomes a *debat*, a *conflictus*. The wit of the poem is destroyed and the tone of it spoiled to modern notion by these interpolations. We have dozens of examples in the *Carmina burana* of patched-together songs. It is interesting to know that by treating No. 89 in a way which experience has seemed to justify in other cases, by removing part of it that ill agrees with the rest, by restoring a reading that may have been altered to suit the needs of a patchwork song, we have a lyric left us which is so unique an instance of clever humor as to stand strikingly forth. What perhaps took place was that a monk or clerk attracted by the dramatic quality of the piece, and its treatment of a theme which appealed to mediaeval taste—the antithesis of carnal and ascetic pursuits—turned a lyric into a *conflictus*. One of the most popular school-books in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was the *Ecloga* of Theodulus, as Mr. Hamilton reminds me. It inspired many a *schularbeit*—it may have spoiled many a lyric (cf. Selbach, *Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenz. Dichtung* [1886]).

"Son: Father, quick with help and counsel, I'm dying and would be a monk. Father: A plague upon logic! It drives clerks to exile and wretchedness. But then you'll no more see him [her] you love, the poor pretty N. the clerk (the mistress). Son: Alack! Whatever to do I know not, I drift in the desert without help. Dry your tears, father, perhaps I am getting better—I've changed my mind anyhow and shall be no monk."

If such twisting of a song be considered idle trifling, let us remember the happy chance that led to Wilhelm Meyer's restoration of two songs out of two fragments, with some trimming of the crust that overlapped the edges of the pastry-tin! (Nos. 81 and 169). Two stanzas of No. 108 are a gloss made by boiling down Juveninus. A similar *denkvers* ruins No. 33. No. 174 is rebuilt of bricks from a demolished No. 36, and No. 176 owes most to No. 37, a little to Nos. 179 and CLXXXVI, and the rest doubtless to an as yet undiscovered source. So runs on the tale. And while I should by no means urge my restoration of No. 89, I cannot yet quite discredit it. Others presumably can—and will.

Peiper long ago called attention to the similarity between the verses in this song

O ars dialectica
Numquam esses cognita,
Quae tot facis clericos
Exules ac miseros,

and lines in the *Amphitryon* of Vitalis; cf. the editions of Osann (1836), Müller (1840); *Bibl. de l'Ecole des chartes*, 2^e ser., Vol. IV, p. 486, and especially Cloetta, *Beitr. z. Littgesch. d. Mittelalters*, Vol. I, pp. 68 ff., 152 f. "What reader of Freytag's *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*," asks Peiper, "does not at such a time think of the Gothic king Theodahad whose weak brain had been confused by Roman rhetors?" Cf. Müllenbach, *Comoediae elegiacae* (1885) and Peiper, "Die profane Komödie des Mittelalters," *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, Vol. V (1876), p. 518.

Popularity of nugae amatoriae.—We should not be too ready to believe that Peter of Blois's lighter songs possessed a popularity beyond the power of flood, fire, or ruin to destroy (*supra*, p. 65); that Abelard wrote lyrics which were on everybody's lips (p. 23); that Walter's poems resounded through all France (pp. 23, 67); that people generally knew of the mocking satires of young Bernard, etc. That sort of statement must be taken with as many grains of salt as must mediaeval ascriptions of poetry to a distant, unknown, or fictitious author. It was a common exaggeration in the Middle Ages to assume more or less world-wide popularity for mediocre performances. Thus in a letter of the late eleventh century (Ivonis, Carnutensis episcopi, epistolae lxvi, lxvii) we hear the following about a poor bishop of Orleans: "Quidam enim concubii sui appellantes eum *Floram* multas rithmicas cantilenas de eo composuerunt, sicut nostis miseriam terrae illius, *per urbes Franciae* in plateis et compitis cantitantur." Thus again Wolter in his *Chronica bremensis* speaks of a certain Otbert who early in the thirteenth century was known *everywhere* for his pretended miracles ("et fama ejus in omni terra personuit"): "carmina elegica fuerunt de eo facta et cantata in viis." Cf. Du Ménil

(1847), p. 5, n. 2; p. 193, n. 6. Examples of such hyperbole might be readily multiplied.

Lighter songs that were popular were ascribed to the famous churchmen and schoolmen of the Middle Ages, and conversely the songs ascribed to them were thought of as popular. Walter's boast of the vogue of his musical songs did not seem strange to that posterity which overvalued his *Alexandreis*. This bulky poem was one of the oftenest read school-texts until the sixteenth century; it was considered by many superior to the work of Vergil and Ovid; its maxims were quoted by writers of the Middle Ages along with the epigrams of classical authors (Giesebrecht *Allg. Monatsschr.*, 1853, 369). It is easy to understand how students came to grant ready credence to overstatements regarding the wide dissemination of the school-lyrics of Walter and others.

Lyrics of reflection.—A dozen times I was near changing my discussion of the didactic lyric (pp. 32 f.), to include under a separate rubric *lyrics of reflection*. Moralizing poems are as a general rule without the pale of lyric expression, but if they happen to achieve individuality like Serlo's *Ego quondam filius* (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. V, p. 297; Werner, *Beiträge*, p. 147), if they are clothed in musical stanzas, if they gain and hold our sympathy, it is difficult to dismiss them unmentioned. Gröber (*Grundriss*, Vol. II, pp. 379-80) sufficiently indicates the type I mean, but when we study such a group of songs as he lists we discover that though they are at times briefer and simpler in cadence and rhyme than most *lehrgedichte*, the difference is apt to be but one of degree and not of kind. It was this sort of *planctus* that monks and clerks embellished and overloaded until the original appeal was lost in the euphuistic mazes of swollen diction. To choose but one example, and that of a high order of merit: the *Cygnus exspirans* (Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus*, Vol. IV, p. 351) is a poem of some direct effectiveness. It opens with a stanza that promises the best:

Parendum est, cedendum est,
Claudenda vitae scena;
Est jacta sors, me vocat mors,
Haec hora est postrema:
Valete res, valete spes;
Sic finit cantilena.

But scarce are we launched in the *planctus* which consists of 72 lines when acervation commences and simplicity ends. Judged by this standard several songs of the *Carmina burana* are of much lyric worth. These are not the famous *Versa est in luctum cythara Waltheri* (LXXXVI) although the refrains indicate it was meant to be sung, nor *Licet aeger cum aegrotis* (LXXI; cf. Wright, *Political Songs*, p. 44; Kingsford, *English Historical Review* [1890], p. 325; Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. XXI, p. 145), nor *Ecce torpet probitas* (LXVII; with two refrains; cf. *Anzeiger f. Kunde d. d. Vorzeit*, Vol. VII, col. 294; Schreiber,

Vagantenstrophe, p. 168), nor yet any of the *planctus* in either Christmas play or Passion play (CCII, CCIII). Even No. VI, graceful as it is in manner, is hardly a song in point because of its grimness of conception and the generality of its phrasing. But Nos. X (*Dum juvenus floruit*) and LXIX (*Florebat olim studium* are musical, not over-earnest, individual in note, and sing themselves. The first runs:

Dum juvenus floruit,
Licuit
Et libuit
Facere quod placuit,
Juxta voluntatem
Currere,
Peragere,
Carnis voluptatem;

and the second is no less happy. The theme of its forty-eight verses is that the clerks are to blame for the decay of learning which in common with all things good is gone quite to the dogs. Scholastic allusion abounds; we hear of Brunel's ass (Nigel Wireker, *Speculum stultorum*), of Gregory, Jerome, the bishop Wikterp of Regensburg, Augustine, Benedict, Mary, Martha, Leah, Rachel, Caro, and Lucrece, but even this ill custom can not stale its infinite variety.

Had there been in all the range of mediaeval Latin lyrics further songs like these, they would have had separate place in the body of the study. But each in its own way these pieces are conspicuous for their isolation in the species to which they belong.

Frauenstrophien.—Curious, it seems to me, is the contention of Wilmanns (*Walther von der Vogelweide*, 1882, p. 165) that if the women-stanzas (cf. *supra*, p. 109) presuppose earlier lyric models than those of *minnesang* these must be songs of professional female minstrels such as can be shown to have existed in Romance countries at this time. "The position in life occupied by these girls permitted them to give frank utterance in song to devoted love and ardent longing, from which a natural reserve and feminine modesty withheld other women. During his Italian journey bishop Wolfger of Passau had opportunity to get such *puellae cantantes* to sing to him."

Even were it necessary to believe women composed the *frauenstrophien*, we should scarcely seek their origin in the performances of *miminnen*, *jongleureses*, and *spielmänninnen*, for there is nothing in the presumptive work and calling of such creatures, in so far as we learn of them, that would inspire the tender lines under discussion.

Stimmungsbrechung.—To the examples of sudden break of mood instanced above (pp. 8, 91) add

Ecce laetantur omnia,
Quaeque dant sua gaudia, —
Excepto me qui gratia
Amicae meae careo.

(Du Ménil [1847], p. 234, from a xiii-century French MS). The same song contains a much simpler *minnegruss* than *Carmina burana* no. 82 (cf. *supra* p. 14):

Quot sunt arenæ littore,
Quot folia in arbore,
Quot rami sunt in nemore,
Tot dolores sustineo;
Ob hoc infirmus corpore,
Quod hanc tenere nequeo.

Rursus quot sunt in aethere
Astra, vel quot sub aere
Homines credo vivere,
Tot vicibus congaudeo
Cum possum mane tangere
Quam semper mente video.

Literati and laici.—Add to the four quotations under this heading (cf. *supra*, p. 123, note 2):

Nuper ego didici, quod semper sunt inimici
Clerici et laici, solet hoc per saecula dici.

Cf. *Romanische Forschungen*, Vol. III, p. 285. Schmeller in a note to the *Mass of Gamesters* (*Carmina burana*, p. 249) remarks that the following is written on the margin of the MS in a later hand than that of the original scribe: Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui inter rusticos et clericos magnam discordiam seminasti, praesta quaesumus de laboribus eorum vivere, de mulieribus ipsorum vero et de morte Deciorum semper gaudere. In a mock-mass of a later time still Werner (*Beiträge*, p. 212) discovers a similar passage:

Audi nos. Nam rustici, qui sunt semper contra nos.
Da eis aquam bibere,
Da nobis vinum bonum consumere.

Vers.: Rustici sunt laeti
Quando sunt repleti

Resp.: Et sunt inflati
Quando sunt inebriati.

Deus, qui multitudinem rusticorum congregasti
Et magnam discordiam inter eos et nos seminasti,
Da, quaesumus, ut laboribus eorum fruamur
Et ab uxoribus eorum diligamur,
Per omnia pocula poculorum. Amen.

In the *Ass's Testament* (cf. *supra*, p. 134) the shoe seems to be on the other foot, for the dying animal of the rustic finds strength to make his will as follows:

Vocem dat cantoribus,
Collum potatoribus,
Virgam dat scholaribus.

Rhymed letters and laudatory odes.—Lack of space forbade quoting sufficient examples of the gallant and amorous versification (cf. *supra*, pp. 72-76) in vogue at the French schools in the twelfth century, to show how stilted and conventionalized it was. He who would learn at a glance the manner of such stereotyped utterance may conveniently do

so by running over several numbers of MS C. 58/275 in the City Library of Zurich (Werner, *Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* [1905]: 48, 49, 66, 116-121) and contrasting them with popularizing *billets doux* such as no. 141 of the *Carmina burana*, which begins:

O mi dilectissima,
Vultu serenissima
Et mente lege sedula
Ut mea refert littera.
Manda liet! manda liet!
Min geselle chumet niet.

The Zurich MS was quite certainly the work of a German clerk who studied at French schools like Orleans and Paris and brought home to Germany with him this notebook, the fruit of his labors. It contains something of every type of poetry current in his day and gives an adequate idea of what was going forward at the time. A short consideration of the material in this book will convince any doubter that neither the goliard lyric or the popular lyric grew on any such trunk. There are but a handful of pieces among the four hundred which comprise the MS that have either life or the popular breath in them: e. g., nos. 15 of the Jew that fell into the privy; 90 Snow-child; 149 Spring-song; 197 Marbod's description of the beauty of spring; 342, 343 Two famous parting songs of the clerk off for school; 365 Confession of Goliath; 386 Serlo's apostrophe to a mispent life—not a dozen numbers in all.

German fabliaux.—Although Bédier defines fabliaux as *contes à rire en vers* (*Les fabliaux*, 1895², pp. 28 ff.) he dates the first one 1159 (cf. his monograph on the 'fabliau de Richeut' in *Études dédiées à M. G. Paris*, 1891). Neglecting the German fabliaux of a much earlier time which are contained in the Cambridge MS, Bédier is thus able to establish his contes as distinctively French types, exemplars of the 'esprit gaulois,' etc. Ker (*Dark Ages*, p. 227) with a clearer because more unprejudiced vision writes as follows: "The comic literature of Germany has never had much credit from other nations, though they have been ready to live on it without acknowledgment, borrowing Till Owlglass and other jesters. In the Middle Ages Germany is ahead of France in a kind which is reckoned peculiarly French; the earliest fabliaux are in German Latin, with Swabians for comic heroes—the story of the *Snow-Child*, and the other *How the Swabian Made the King say 'That's a story.'* The former one with considerable elegance in phrasing tells a story fit for the *Decameron*; the other with less ambition gives one of the well-known popular tales—a monstrous lie rewarded with the hand of the king's daughter. The malice of the *Snow-Child* is something different from anything in vernacular literature till the time of Boccaccio and Chaucer; the learned language and the rather difficult verse perhaps helping to refine the mischief of the story. It is self-conscious, amused at its own craft: a different thing from the ingenuous simplicity of the French

"merry tales," not to speak of the churlish heaviness of the worst among them." Ker could have added to his enumeration of early German fabliaux the tales of Heriger and Alfrad, at least, without exceeding Bédier's definition, even if it should be felt that *Unibos* (Gevatter Einochs), and certain shorter animal tales like *Priester und Wolf* or *Hahn und Fuchs* scarcely came within the category.

Other *lügenmärchen* that have come down to us in the early poetry of the cloister are the *Three Brothers and the Goat* and *Notker's Mushroom* (cf. *Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vols. II, p. 474, IV, p. 336; *Neue Jahrbücher*, Vol. V, pp. 347 ff., Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, pp. 15 ff.), one written by Notker, it may be, the other by Ekkehard IV. When we recall the droll tales mentioned above, when we remember the precious humor and satire which-breathes at times in the *Gesta Karoli* (Eishere, the Goblin and the Farrier, the Bishop and the Jew) and the *Casus Sancti Galli* (Heribald and the Hungarians, the Scourging of Sindolf, Hadwig at the Hohentwiel), when we view Wichart's son's satire *De amicitia et conubio* (Keinz, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. IV, p. 145), Walafrid's reply to Probus, Ermenrich's yarn about Homer, Orcus and the Louise, Liutprand's story of the pranks of Emperor Leo, or Rather's fable of the Frog and the Mouse—it is difficult for us to credit the statement that the first *conte à rire en vers* was French and of the year 1159.

Tenth-century culture.—In an earlier essay (*Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 424) two records of the tenth century are used to bring into sharp contrast the dulness and the brilliance of imagination which characterized that time, and to prove that offhand summing-up of this period as one of gloom is inadvisable. Bartoli, for example, to quote but one incisive critic among many, says: "Il medio evo non pensa: esso non ha che un sentimento solo predominante, quello dell' oltremondano, che lo preoccupa, lo assorbe, lo atterrisce e lo inebria" (*I precursori del rinascimento*, p. 19). Better far than Bartoli's one-sided assertion is Ker's setting-off of Gerbert of Rheims and Rodulph Glaber against each other: "Gerbert is followed in literary history by Rodulphus, like a hero with a comicsquire: Rodulphus represents the permanent underlayer of mediaeval absurdity above which Gerbert rises so eminently; the two together make it impossible to arrive at any easy generalization about the culture of the Dark Ages. Gerbert's letters are those of a man for whom there were other interests besides rhetoric and philosophy, they admit one to a close acquaintance with the very life of that obscure time, and a knowledge of actual motives and character. Some of his short notes have the same kind of reality as Cicero's, being not records or reflections but practical agents in a great revolution. Rodulphus' book is one of the most authentic renderings anywhere to be found of the average mind of the time—both in the contents of the mind, visions, portents, stories, and in its artless,

movement from any point to any circumference. He has sometimes been treated too heavily, as if the whole Middle Age were summed up in Rodulphus Glaber. That is not so." (*Dark Ages*, pp. 198 f.)

In other words, the tenth century like any other was a time of many possibilities. So far as the lyric is concerned, monks were apt to write monkish odes, minstrels were quite as sure to compose musical songs. There is no lyric poem out of earlier cloister-life warmer than Walafrid's *Elegy to Home* (*Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vol. II, p. 412), but the Cambridge MS alone is sufficient to show what the minstrels were doing. We should not interpret the culture of the tenth century in terms of either type by itself.

Profane lyrics in Latin plays:—Taylor has shown (*Modern Philology*, Vols. IV, pp. 605 ff., V, pp. 1 ff.) the influence of Middle English religious lyrics on the development of the drama; cf. also Thien, *Über die englischen Marienklagen* (1906). Wechssler performed a like service for the Romance planctus (1893) and Schönbach for the German (1874). Bibliography in Taylor, p. 606, note 1, and Chambers, *Medieval Stage*, Vol. II, p. 39. The former promises soon a paper on the influence of the satire of the day upon Corpus Christi plays; it is to be hoped he will extend his work to include the didactic lyric and the lyric of reflection. But no one has as yet undertaken to examine all the evidence that exists to show how dependent the mediaeval church- and school-plays were upon the profane, erotic lyrics of their time.

Santangelo (*Studio sulla poesia goliardica*, pp. 46 f.) made a beginning by grouping together the Latin lyrics which occur in Christmas and Easter plays in three instances (*Carmina burana*, nos. 202, 203; Du Ménil [1847], p. 213). One can scarcely blame Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Herrad of Landsberg for their censure of ecclesiastical plays, if many of them contained such verses as those employed in the Benedictbeuern Easter play (*Carmina burana*, pp. 92, 149, 275; a completer version in Hauréau, *Not. et Extr.*, Vol. XXIX, ii, p. 314); of which it will suffice to give the last two stanzas:

Respondenti metus
Trahit hanc ad fletus
Sed natura laetus
Amor indiscretus
Queam
Lineam
Jam pudoris tangere,
Meam
In eam
Manum mittit propere.
Dum proprio,
Vim infero,
Post imminente machina.
Nec supero,
Nam aspero
Defendens ungue limina
Osserat introitus.

Tantalus admotum
Non amitto potum;
Sed ne meum totum
Frustrat illa votum,
Suo
Denuo
Collo jungens brachium
Ruo,
Diruo
Tricaturam crurium.
Ut virginem
Devirginem,
Me totum toti insero,
Ut cardinem
Determinem,
Duellum istud resero.
Gloriar victoria.

It is difficult to determine in the light of such evidence whether songs like these were inserted in dramas for the purpose of lending the required tone of wordliness, the desirable contrast to the godly conversation elsewhere employed, or whether the opportunity was taken to introduce scabrous material for its own sake.

The Meaning of "goliard."—Schönbach complains that council-decrees and synod-statutes which deal with the attitude of the church toward the popular festivals and entertainments have not been investigated with sufficient care and accuracy. He demands that Spanish enactments of the seventh century which have been handed down in transcripts be not utilized in determining the state of German culture during the twelfth century (*Die Anfänge des Minnesangs*, p. 3). Now the first decree regarding goliards is the order of Gautier of Sens (d. 913), the last is the *concilium Frisingense* (1440), more than 500 years apart. These statutes are given in Germany, France, and England; some of them speak of the goliard specifically as of a certain class of person, some of them—particularly the later ones—treat him as any sort of entertainer. It is equally dangerous to generalize from one of these decretals or to particularize from them all together. Santangelo (*op. cit.*, p. 14) asserts: "I goliardi furono giullari e non scolari vaganti: proverò che non furon nemmeno poeti, cioè gli autori della poesia goliardica." This statement is doubtless true of some goliards in some country at some time between the Dark Ages and the Renaissance—Chaucer's *goliardeys* for example was a miller and no clerk. But as a general contention Santangelo's remark is uncritical, for in many of our references to goliards we have but examples of the heaping-up of words so dear to the mediaeval mind. Cf., for instance, the meaningless lists of names included under "familia Herlekini" (Driesen, *Der Ursprung des Herlekin* [1904], pp. 33 ff.)

Der Marner (*floruit ca. 1230*) was a clerk who wrote Latin songs, five of which have descended to us (cf. Strauch, *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. XIV [1876], pp. 94, 129; *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vols. XXII [1876], p. 254, XXIV [1878], p. 90; Meyer, *Fragmenta burana*. But Marner was at the same time a common player and minstrel and has informed us somewhat scornfully what a varied stock of goods the *spielmann* had to have within his roll (cf. Strauch, XV, 14 and 16, pp. 124, 127). Some of his wares were the old heroic tales and myths, some the courtly *minnesang*. In the former content mattered, not the shape of the recital (*der wigt mîn wort ringer danne ein ort*; "my words they hold not worth a doit"), in the latter it was the poetic setting that the audience cared for. And Marner was ready with every sort from the simplest German saw to the polished Latin ode on the Abbot of Maria-Saal or the *Jam pridum aestivalia* (*Carm. bur.*, No. 95; Zingerle, *Wiener Sitzungsber.*, Vol.

LIV [1866], p. 319). Konrad Marner therefore furnishes an interesting phase of the goliard situation in the thirteenth century, but it is not safe to generalize too much from this single instance.

Golias < *gula*.—Thomas Wright in proposing the etymology Golias from *gula*, "gullet, throat, palate" (*Latin Poems* [1841], p. x) was but following the authority of writers from twelfth century to fourteenth. Gerald of Barri's well-known description of Golias in the *Speculum ecclesiae*. "Item, parasitus quidam Golias nomine nostris diebus gulositatē pariter et leccacitatē famosissimus" contains a play upon words still popular in Piers Plowman: "a goliardeis, a gloton of wordes." But this derivation springs like many other similar ones from the inexplicable English delight in punning, or at least from the distressing habit of paronomasia so common to mediaeval scholasticism. An etymology thus born should be viewed askance as the following passage proves. I quote fully for two reasons, first, because of the evident appositeness to our theme; second, because I do not think the passage is well-known. I found it in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Classical Series), Vol. I, Part V, p. 62: *Glossae in Sidonium* (twelfth century):

Leccatorum multa genera. Quidam enim dicuntur mimi, quidam balatrones, quidam nebulones, quidam nepotes, quidam scurrae, quidam lenones, quidam histriones, quidam parasiti, quidam pharmacopolae, a pharmaca quod est unguentum et pole quod est vendere. De mimis dicit Horatius in Sermonibus Ambubaiarum collegia pharmacopolae Mendici mimi balatrones hoc penus omne Maestum ac sollicitum est mei pro morte Tigelli. Et notandum quod balatrones dicuntur a baratro quod est infernus. Dicitur autem baratrum quasi voratrum quia omnia devorat. Inde balatrones quasi voratores, quia propria devorant et aliena consumunt. Dicuntur nebulones a nebula quia ad modum nebulae transit gloria eorum. Vel quia aliena vitia per suas adulationes obaecant. Dicuntur nepotes a nepa serpente quae suos fetus devorat. Scurra proprie appellatur vagus qui de domo ad domum discurret ut ventrem satiet. De quibus bene dicitur, Quorum deus venter est. Unde Magister Serlo Scurrae jejuni te contra guttura muni. Lenones dicuntur conciliatores stupri. Unde quidam egregius versificator Leno ferre pedem talem non debet in aedem. Hac habitare domo debet honestus homo. Histrion dicitur ab historon quod est adulari. Unde quidam in cantilena sua Meretur histrio virtutis praemium, Dum palpat vitium dulci mendacio. Parasiti dicuntur quasi parantes situs hominum vel quasi juxta parapsidem siti.

Archipoeta and Walther von der Vogelweide.—More than thirty years ago Martin remarked certain correspondences between Walther's verse and goliardic poetry (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XX, p. 66): "Doch es liesse sich auch sonst wol so manches in Walthers gedanken und ausdrücken mit der lateinischen vagantenpoesie vergleichen: nicht nur als *minnedichter* deren scholastik ja auch bei den andern mhd. lyrikern nachwürkt, sondern auch als mahner zum kreuzzug und gegner der römischen curie waren ihm die fahrenden kleriker vorausgegangen." The same statement recurs in Burdach's *Walther von der Vogelweide* (1900), pp. 37, 42, 184 f., although it has never been subjected to a thoroughgoing analysis: "Nach dem Vorbild der lateinisch dichten-

den Vaganten gestaltet Walther die deutsche volksmässige gnomische Dichtung der Spielleute in seiner Weise um. Er wird ein Nachfolger der Spervogelschen Schule und zugleich des Archipoeta. Das muss auch auf seine *Liebespoesie* entscheidend einwirken, sie von Grund aus umgestalten." "Er ist der erste ritterliche Sänger, der halb und halb das Leben und die Kunst der Fahrenden, der Vaganten sich aneignet. Er muss wie seine Vorläufer, der Spervogelsche Kreis und die Goliarden, nach der Gunst der Herren streben." "Die lateinische Vagantendichtung lebt in diesen Vorstellungen. Der Archipoeta verherrlichte in überschwänglicher Weise das staufische Imperium . . . Ihm erscheint Friedrich Barbarossa als neuer Karl der Grosse . . . Walther, auf den die Vagantenlieder vielfach eingewirkt haben, mag wohl auch von diesen Stimmen enthusiastischer Kaiserverherrlichung gerührt worden sein."

Now if these things are true, and there is at present no good reason to doubt them, it should be the duty of someone carefully to gather and sift the philological evidence, that it can be adduced as proof. Until this is done we cannot know how direct the influence which mediaeval Latin poetry exercised on Walther's political and love lyrics. For of course another possibility always exists, viz., that both Latin and German poems were modeled after a Provençal (French) original.

Recently (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLVII [1904], p. 319) Martin has cited various themes and phrases of Walther's which are analogous to passages in Andreas Capellanus' *De Amore* (ed. Trojel, 1892) a book written in the last decade or two of the twelfth century (cf. Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 44). But how far Martin is justified in terming Andreas' work "a Latin source of German minnesang"—that still remains to be seen.

Early minstrelsy.—I hesitated to include in my list of early Latin minstrelsy (Part I, pp. 44 ff.) the verses which Heyne recovers (from *Opera Gregorii Turonensis*, edd. Arndt et Krusch, Vol. II, p. 651) regarding the *spielmann* of King Miro. Cf. Heyne, *Altdeutsch-lateinische Spielmannsgedichte des X. Jahrhunderts* (1900), p. xxiv. They are supposedly of the year 589:

Heu, misero succurite
Oppresso mi subvenite,
Adpenso relevamini
Et pro me sancti Martini
Virtutem deprecamini,
Qui tali plaga adfligor,
Tali exitu crucior,
Incisione disjungor.

The minstrel (Reich, *Der Mimus*, Vol. I, p. 826, calls him *hofnarr*) disobedient to the command of his lord Miro tries to pick a bunch of ripe grapes in the arbor before the portal of St. Martin's Church. His hand is caught as in a vise and his arm begins to wither. At first the *spiel-*

mann laughs and pretends it is all one of his trade tricks, but the pain soon overcomes him and he cries out in anguish: "succurite, viri, misero, subvenite oppresso, relevamini, adpenso et sancti antistitis Martini virtutem pro me deprecamini, qui tali exitu crucior, tali plaga adfligor, tali incisione disjungor."

Sequence and Leich.—In connection with the claim that profane song was born of the sequence (Part I, p. 6) it is interesting to recall that Lachmann wrote in 1829: "When I can produce Latin poems which two hundred years before the *leiche* have just the *leich*-form, dactyls and all but without rhyme; when these poems although in part secular are descended from church-music and from a very similar form that is still about a century older; then I dare say no one will hesitate to derive the *leiche*, and with them the dactylic rhythms, from ecclesiastical poetry" (*Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 334). Later Lachmann prints the Cambridge poem on the snow-child and the *modus Ottinc*, remarking (p. 339): "These poems are themselves apparently only a development of the sacred type whose inventor was Notker Balbulus."

Bibliographical notes.—The "literature" devoted to many of the topics discussed in the foregoing study is extensive. It seemed unnecessary, at times impossible, to present all of it or even much of it in footnotes without overburdening my pages beyond endurance. My annotation therefore contents itself with being suggestive and nowhere attempts to be completing. In a few instances I have cited the title of a book which I have not personally studied, but on the other hand have refrained from mentioning much that did not seem essential. I have assumed that there is small need of listing recondite sources of information when convenient bibliographies are easy of access, when such collections as Chevalier's *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge* (Vol. I² [1905]; Vol. II [1886]), and Hauréau's *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins* (6 vols., 1890-93) are at the command of every student of mediaeval philology. This hesitation has left certain longer notes in doubtful shape. Perhaps I would better have added to my references on the snow-child (p. 7, n. 1) Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde* (1879), pp. 101 f.; and (as Hamilton suggests) Dunlop-Liebrecht, *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, pp. 41, 499, 522, 542; R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III (1900), p. 564. I omitted these titles as they offered no new verse-version of the theme treated. Or again in dealing with the Goliath tradition I might have left out certain references, if I did not care to enlarge upon the matter and include others such as Hauréau, Vol. I, p. 387; III, 197; IV, 233, 282-86, 330; VI, 215; *Not. et Extr.*, Vol. XXXII, part 1; Martin, *Observations sur le roman de Renart*, pp. 15, 51. The name of Santangelo in this note, for instance (p. 24), reminds me that I did not list the interesting reflections of other Italian writers such as

Gabrielli, Corradino, Straccali, Ronca, Novati, etc. It seemed, however, that this would be merely to speak by the card and therefore ill-advised.

Page 13, 26.—For Grosseteste substitute William of Wadington; cf. Robert of Brunne's *Handling Synne*, ed. Furnivall (1903), vv. 9045 ff. On the *danseurs maudits* cf. Paris, *Journal des savants* (1899), pp. 733 ff.

Page 15, note 1.—Hertz's notes are abundantly added to by Schönbach in his *Studien zur geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt*, Part II (1900), pp. 56-89 (= *Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. CXLII, 7th essay).

Page 19, 32.—Rand thinks the *delusor* possibly suggested by Terence's own retorts to his critic Lanuvinus. "Mediaeval scholia on Terence may help out on this point—there are suggestive remarks in those published by Schlee, but nothing definite enough to cite." The form of the poem reminds of the *Ecloga Theoduli*. On the study of Terence in the Middle Ages cf. Magnin, *Bibl. de l'École des chartes*, Vol. I, p. 524; Riese, *Zeitschr. f. d. österr. Gymnasien* (1867), p. 442; Köpke, *Hrotsvit v. Gandersheim* (1869), pp. 152, 159, 183; Creizenach, *Gesch. d. neueren Dramas*, Vol. I (1893), p. 17; Cloetta, *Beitr. z. Littgesch. d. Mittelalters*, Vol. I (1890), pp. 2, 4; Gabotto, *Appunti sulla fortuna di alcuni autori romani nel medio evo* (1891), cap. 6 "Terenzio;" Abel, *Die Terenzbiographien des Altertums u. des Mittelalters* (1887); Dziatzko, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil.* (1894), p. 465; Manitius, *Philologus* (1894), p. 546; Sabbadini, *Studi ital. di filol. class.* (1897), p. 314; Francke, *Terenz u. d. latein. Schulkomödie* (1877); Herrmann, *Mitteil. d. Ges. f. deut. Erzieh.- u. Schulgeschichte* (1893), p. 1; Galzigna, *Fino a che punto i commediografi del rinascimento abbiano imitato Plauto e Terenzio*, Pt. 1 (1899); Santoro, *La Taide in Terenzio e in Dante* (1902). Several of these titles I owe to my colleague, Mr. Beeson.

Page 27, note 3.—The monk of Froidmont is now generally believed to be Helinant; cf. *Les vers de la mort*, edd. Wulff et Walberg (*Société des anciens textes français*, 1905), p. vi. The sermon from which the quotation is made was probably preached in 1229 (cf. *ibid.*, p. xxvi).

Page 35, 5.—For example, the *Quondam fuit factus festus* and the *Sermo noster audiat* (cf. Wilh. Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 406 ff.). The first of these has exactly the same stanza-form as the "Ave," the identical continuous rhyme of the seven-syllabled lines in *ia*, the second one is evidently a close formal copy of the first. Both the poems depict the lowest scenes of monastic life in the vulgarist diction. Interesting, but unanswerable, is Meyer's question, if the *Quondam fuit* did not suggest to the authors of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* the stylistic device of mocking the old-fashioned university people by having them write ungainly Latin.

Page 38, 22.—Cf. Tobler, *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, Vol. IX, pp. 288 ff.; Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo* (1896)², Vol. II, pp. 112 ff. (Engl. transl. [1895], pp. 325 ff.); Novati, *Carmina medii aevi* (1883), pp. 15 ff., *Attraverso il medio evo* (1905), pp. 51 ff., 95 ff.; Valmaggi, *Lo spirito antifemminile nel medio evo* (1890); Pascal, "Antifemminismo medievale," *Poesia latina medievale* (1907), pp. 151-84. All necessary references and bibliography are given in one or another of these studies.

Page 41, note 1.—For "we know" in l. 2 substitute "Hauréau believes;" and after "Roger" in l. 8 read "who does not share Hauréau's enthusiasm."

Page 42, 23.—For the best recent discussion of *De cuculo* cf. Pascal, *op. cit.*, pp. 123 ff.

Page 53, note 1.—I should perhaps have added to the note regarding May-fête origins reference to the discussion and bibliography contained in Jeanroy's article on "Les chansons" (in Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, Vol. I [1896], pp. 362 ff., 403 f.).

Page 61, notes 1 and 2.—I might have omitted these notes if I had had access to Ronca's study "La prima poesia d' amore in Italia dopo il mille," *Fanfulla della domenica*, Vol. XIII, No. 6.

Page 82, note 2.—Wilh. Meyer would doubt the statement that minstrels wrote well in Romance long before the middle of the ninth century. He says (*Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, p. 40): "The most distinguished poets were the writers of Latin quantitative hexameters, inferior to them were the authors of Latin rhythms. But those who attempted to make verses in the different national languages or in one of the many dialects were least esteemed. In France and in the Romance countries Latin was understood by even the least cultured. Therefore a need or a desire for texts in the vulgar tongue did not arise in France till much later [than in the eighth century]. The oldest poems in French that we possess originated in a period when Latin rhythmic poets already observed carefully the scheduled number of syllables, when sequences were already composed in which the same number of syllables was maintained: Phtongis paribus metricata phalanx reboet ac librata (*von der Gegenstrophe*, Dreves, *Analecta hymnica*, Vol. X, p. 150). Naturally then even the oldest French rhythmic poets enumerate their syllables carefully."

Page 85, note 1.—Add the title "Das erste Gedicht der Carmina Burana" (*Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1908, pp. 189 ff.), in which Wilh. Meyer shows no. 66 to be the merest fragment of the poem *Manus ferens munera* (cf. Wright, *Walter Mapes*, p. 226).

Page 87, note 6.—Add Bartsch, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Literatur* (1872), p. 26; Ronca, *Cultura medievale*, p. 152.

Page 105, note 2.—For further reference to popular tales and songs in mediaeval French sermons cf. Bourgain, *La chaire française au xii. siècle* (1879), pp. 227 ff., La Marche, *La chaire française au moyen âge* (1886)², pp. 284 ff.

Errata.—It seems unnecessary to list all the minor slips in spelling and type contained in the preceding parts of this study: they are evident to any careful reader. Thus, "Robinson" [p. 26, n. 1] should be "Robertson;" "Stephan" [p. 23] is "Stephen;" "a" [p. 40, l. 13] should be "as," etc. But I do not wish to be thought deliberately guilty of the plural form "conflicti" [p. 28] and certain other instances of questionable Latin which were allowed to escape revision because of a confusion in the proof-sheets.

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

